

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. VII, 2.

WHOLE NO. 26.

---

## I.—SPEECH-MIXTURE IN FRENCH CANADA. EXTERNAL INFLUENCE.

In the introductory article,<sup>1</sup> a glance was given at the early history of the Province of Quebec, in order that something of the original dialect-elements of the present speech of French Canada might be understood, and that the general characteristics which mark the east and west zones of the Gallic idiom, as it exists in the Dominion, might be clearly kept in view for the investigation which is to follow. It would be not only interesting but fascinating to develop this sketch of the history of a people whose every struggle for national existence has been characterized by the noblest self-sacrifice, by the highest personal valor and, above all, by the profoundest sense of the importance to them of their religion and language. The motto *Notre Langue, Notre Religion et Nos Coutumes* has been ever present with them, and to it their hearts have been tuned when the power of the oppressor has threatened to crush them. It would be instructive, in the interest of the general subject of language, to discuss the sundry attempts made by their rulers to tear away from them this heritage, their strongest and safest bulwark as a distinct and separate people. The suppression of French schools, the prohibition of French in all governmental relations, the refusal of the dominant race to learn French, the contempt in which the proud sons of Gaul were held—all of these would form interesting and instructive chapters where might be portrayed the unswerving tenacity of purpose, the strong character and the bold disregard of danger on the part of the French in the most trying circumstances when religion and

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. VI, p. 135 seq. of this Journal.

language have been at stake. But such discussions would carry us too far from the special object of the present work, which is to treat the language as actually found in the Canadian provinces.

Could we stop at the broad lines of demarcation as indicated for the dialects in the preliminary study just referred to; could we take into account the few linguistic varieties only that constituted the original speech-compound, we should find it no very difficult task to trace the interlacing threads of these language-forms and to note their reciprocal influences in the production of existing types; but the problem here is conditioned by incomparably greater difficulties. The individual dialects that were brought to these shores by the earliest settlers serve simply as so many definite and well-determined *points d'appui*, as so many trusty landmarks in the labyrinth of a linguistic mixture that was the natural outgrowth of constant and promiscuous immigration for more than one hundred and fifty years. It is fortunate for the investigator that he has these fixed points in the field of his observation, otherwise much of his searching would be in vain, and much of what he might think to be real discovery would be only conjecture with reference to the great mass of his many-colored and perplexing material.

We find at work in Canada all those agencies which produce speech-mixture among languages where the types are more distinct and where the relations of these types have settled into that special mould that marks the separation of language from dialect. Of course, the more intimate the relation between any two forms of speech, the more easy is the passage of the one to the other, provided they both belong to the same generic stock; and it is this position, as we shall see further on, which the set of dialects of the Province of Quebec holds with reference to the varieties of speech that belong particularly to the maritime provinces; that is, instead of being distinctly individual languages, they must be regarded as different phases of one general speech, but possessing at the same time characteristics sufficiently marked to individualize them and make them represent, for all working purposes, two distinct forms of language. I shall consider, therefore, this subject of speech-mixture under the various headings that mark the natural mingling of linguistic forms, such as the influence of the purely external circumstances of life and the influence of divergent linguistic products upon one another. It may easily happen, in certain cases, that the second part of this classification is contained in or conditioned by the first; in truth, precisely here in Canada we shall

note how it is that peculiar circumstances of life have especially contributed to certain developments of speech that could never have existed had it not been for their concurrence at a given time in the political, social and religious experiences of the people. And nowhere else, perhaps, have these cardinal functions of organic growth in civilized society acted more powerfully toward the production of a composite language. It is here, if anywhere, that we must carefully consider the reflex of the feudal system in language-making; it is here that the social and religious life, bound together into an indissoluble whole, have left their indelible stamp upon the speech, from the humblest peasant who left France to act the part of pioneer of French civilization on the American continent, down to his peaceable, hard-working, frugal, self-sacrificing descendant of to-day, the *habitant*, who no longer rejoices in the *patois* of his ancestor, but who has risen, without effort and unsuspectingly, to a higher plane in the scale of linguistic development.

The mere circumstance of bringing together emigrants for the New World from several of the chief departments of France, in an age where the means of communication among the different linguistic centres were slow and laborious, and when, consequently, the varieties of idiom were much more marked than we now have them—this condition of things alone, I say, was sufficient to produce important changes in the language of inhabitants who, before this, had never come into any social relation with one another, and whose necessary contact and more or less intimate association after they had once planted foot upon American soil afforded an opportunity to take the initial steps in that *Ausgleichung* of grammar-forms and intermixture of phonetic elements which are found to-day in the Canadian language, common in all essential particulars to the provinces of the Dominion, wherever French is spoken.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I shall not be anticipating here too much a special treatment of that phase of the Canadian French, generally known as the Acadian, which exists in the maritime provinces—Nova Scotia (including Cape Breton, Isle Madame), New Brunswick and Prince Edward—and the original sources of which were the *Langue d'Oc* dialects, if I state in this connection that the common notion held with reference to it is erroneous—namely, that it is a clearly defined dialect variety with so marked characteristics as to be easily distinguishable from its sister on the lower St. Lawrence. For the most part, it does not constitute to-day a dialect species so sharply separated from the current Canadian idiom as to entitle it to the dignity of being regarded as a separate and independent

Another feature, furthermore, of the mixed society must be borne in mind, as it will help to explain how the process of social amalgamation was carried forward with so universal success. I refer to the superior character of the earliest settlers. The originators of the emigration movement in France, and the later directors of the Canadian colonization projects, were men of integrity, of broad views, and of extended experience in foreign lands. They were property-holders themselves, and hence understood the advantages that would accrue to the new communities by having such only of their subjects to follow them as had the means to subsist, and as had sufficient intelligence to easily adapt themselves to the circumstances of their new life. The wise and proper selection of peasants, therefore, for the first ships that sailed from the Old World to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, was of paramount importance to the leaders of an enterprise fraught with so many dangers at that time. The "rank and file" of these pioneers were naturally chosen, then, from the more prosperous and thrifty class of the common folk, and thus, at the very start of the colonies, favorable conditions existed for the immediate growth of a form of language more homogeneous than that which existed in the mother country, where the social elements were more diverse and consequently less congenial. And that not only a strong tendency to uniformity of speech actually did develop among these colonists, but also that the results of it were surprising, is manifest from the testimony of sundry writers before the Conquest in 1760. In truth, some of them go so far as to maintain that better French was spoken on the banks of the St. Lawrence than in France itself, and account in part for this extraordinary state of things by the less mixed character of society and the large proportion of educated persons who had joined the expeditions to the American Continent.

The Récollet father Chrétien Leclercq, referring to this subject, says: "I could scarcely understand when a celebrated man [Father Germain Allard, afterward Bishop of Vence] said to me one day that I should be surprised to find in Canada so nice a people

order of linguistic growth. That fundamental differences did once exist between the two must be admitted, but the levelling process has been so widespread as to have done away with many of the originally distinctive marks of the South French of which it was formerly a part. In truth, as we shall see hereafter, we often find to our surprise, in these Acadian districts, that both the phonetics and morphology are nearer the model of the North French than the language of the Province of Quebec, where the *Langue d'Oil* dialects were the sources drawn on from the beginning for the speech-material.

[*d'honnêtes gens*]; that he did not know another province of the Kingdom where there was more intelligence, sagacity [*pénétration*] and politeness on the part of the people; and added that we should even find there a very polished language, with clear and distinct enunciation and a pronunciation without accent. But when I was on the spot, I recognized that they had not exaggerated anything to me, New France being in this respect more fortunate than the colonies established in other parts of the world."

The Mère de l'Incarnation (whose acquaintance we shall make a little further on), one of the most celebrated characters connected with the early history of Canada, also said what was repeated in substance by Charlevoix: "Nowhere else do they speak our language more purely: one cannot note here the least accent." The annalist, Bacqueville de la Poterie, bears testimony to the same fact. "Although," she says, "there is here a mixture from all the provinces of France, one cannot distinguish the speech of any one of them in particular among the Canadians."

Again, we call upon the Abbé D'Olivet. He writes: "One might send an opera to Canada and it could be sung at Quebec, note for note, just as in Paris; but you could not send a conventional phrase to Bordeaux or Montpellier and find that it would be pronounced syllable for syllable as at the Court."

In fact, under the Comte de Frontenac a certain Sieur de Mareuil gave theatrical representations at Quebec, and, according to Isidore Lebrun, Lescarbot had 'Le Triomphe de Neptune' played at Port-Royal, which is a very much greater source of astonishment, considering the districts of France whence were drawn the inhabitants of this city.

Sieur Franquet, Royal Commissary, in writing to France about the women of the Province, says: "They are generally very intelligent and speak a pure French without the slightest accent. Accomplished and gay, they converse in a very agreeable manner."

But it was not the people of their own race alone who found that the Canadians spoke good French. The learned Swedish traveller Kalm, speaking of how sensitive the women were about their language, makes the following remark: "The ladies and girls of Canada, and particularly those of Montreal, are disposed to laugh at the mistakes that foreigners make in speaking their language. Here French is rarely spoken except by the Gallic race, for there are very few foreigners, and the savages, naturally too proud to learn French, oblige the colonists to learn their language. It thus

happens, therefore, that the ladies of Canada cannot hear any peculiar or extraordinary mode of speech without laughing."<sup>1</sup>

We shall note, further on, the special influence of the clergy and of their educational institutions on the language. What we want to understand first is that the character of the mass of the people in these colonies of the North originally differed very materially from that which we find in most other settlements of European colonization at that time. It was no penal colony; they were no set of political convicts or social misdemeanants<sup>2</sup> sent out to be gotten rid of by the home government, but were serious, hard-working, thrifty citizens, representing the cream of their society, just as their leaders, spiritual and temporal, represented the bluest blood that France had to offer in those days. That they found a better world on this side of the Atlantic is natural, all things being considered, since their relations to their masters were less exacting here and the chances for a more generous existence were at hand.

In truth, it may be asserted, I think, without fear of contradiction, that never in the history of the Canadian colonies were these people reduced to such a state of misery and ignorance as La Bruyère mentions in his *Les Charactères ou les Moeurs de ce Siècle*: "L'on voit certains animaux farouches, des mâles et des femelles, répandus par la campagne, noirs, livides et tout brûlés du soleil, attachés à la terre qu'ils fouillent et qu'ils remuent avec une opiniâtreté invincible; ils ont comme une voix articulée, et quand ils se lèvent sur leurs pieds, ils montrent une face humaine, et en effet ils sont des hommes. Ils se retirent la nuit dans les tanières, où ils vivent de pain noir, d'eau et de racines; ils épargnent aux autres hommes la peine de semer, de labourer et de recueillir pour

<sup>1</sup> For these items bearing specially upon the purity of the French as spoken by the early settlers of Canada, I am indebted to an interesting monograph (now out of print) furnished me by the author, M. Bibaud *s fils*, of Montreal, entitled: *Le Mémorial des Vicissitudes et des Progrès de la Langue française en Canada*. Montréal, 1879.

<sup>2</sup> I am aware that the Marquis de la Roche is said to have ransacked the prisons of France, whence he collected a set of ruffians, robbers and cut-throats, who accompanied him to the New World. This, however, was among the earliest attempts to found a French settlement on these shores, and, besides being confined to the small Isle du Sable, off the coast of Nova Scotia, the company that landed consisted of only forty men, who, through privations and the rigors of the climate, finally perished, or went back home after a few years. The project, then, to start the colony with convicts miscarried. Cf. Francis Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World*, pp. 210-12.

vivre, et méritent ainsi de ne pas manquer de ce pain qu'ils ont semé."<sup>1</sup>

Few, if any, of this class ever joined the wanderers across the ocean, even in the latter days of exclusive French rule, and to-day not a trace or reminiscence of such abject wretchedness is to be found with the *habitant* of Canada, whose Norman instincts manifest themselves in the acquisition of this world's goods. His neighbors, the Bretons, used to say of him that he did not pray for wealth, but only to be placed near somebody that had it.<sup>2</sup> I am borne out in the expression of the above opinion concerning the character of the early peasant in New France by no less authority also than the Hon. P. J. O. Chauveau, one of the most celebrated writers of Canada to-day, who was for eighteen years at the head of the Department of Public Instruction for Lower Canada and for the Province of Quebec. In his admirable work on public instruction in Canada,<sup>3</sup> he says: "On aurait tort de croire que la population des campagnes a été, à n'importe quelle époque, dans cette ignorance absolue et abrutissante dont on est encore frappé chez les basses classes de quelques pays européens. Dès les premiers temps, un grand nombre de colons arrivaient au Canada tout instruits, et les vieux registres conservés à Québec et à Montréal établissent qu'une forte proportion d'entre eux savait écrire. Leur éducation domestique était, en général, excellente, et les traditions de la famille canadienne, entretenues et ravivées par l'enseignement religieux, suppléèrent assez longtemps au manque d'écoles. Bien des mères de famille, instruites par les Soeurs de la Congrégation, se firent les institutrices de leurs propres enfants, garçons aussi bien que filles."

Again: "En très-grand nombre, les premiers colons étaient instruits . . . Mais ils avaient mieux que cela, c'était une génération forte et formée aux traditions religieuses et sociales du pays, à cette époque le plus civilisé et le plus éclairé de l'Europe. L'éducation domestique, la première, la plus essentielle, celle à laquelle l'instruction, n'importe à quel degré, ne supplée que difficilement, ne supplée aucunement si elle n'est appuyée sur l'idée religieuse, l'éducation de ces premiers colons était excellente et c'est elle qui,

<sup>1</sup> Œuvres de La Bruyère. Nouvelle édition par M. G. Servois. De L'Homme, Vol. II, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Atlantic Monthly, XLVIII 773.

<sup>3</sup> L'Instruction Publique au Canada. Précis historique et statistique par M. Chauveau, ancien ministre de l'instruction publique dans le Province de Québec. Québec, Coté et Cie., 1876, p. 56.

transmise d'âge en âge, a valu à leurs descendants le titre de peuple gentilhomme."<sup>1</sup>

But there was no difficulty for the peasant in Canada to acquire a liberal means of subsistence after the colony had once taken a foothold there; his social status was greatly improved by his constant and intimate relations with those of his own class, and his language was bettered by the friendly and democratic conditions in which he lived with his lord.

The Intendant, Jacques Duchesneau, who received his commission in 1675, wrote four years later (November 10, 1679)—that is, after he had become thoroughly acquainted with the country in his official capacity—to the Minister Colbert: "As for such of the laboring class as apply themselves steadily to the cultivation of the soil, they not only live very well, but are incomparably better off than the better sort of peasants in France."<sup>2</sup> The Canadian seigneur belonged to the best stock in France; he was a kind master, and showed by his intercourse with the people that he appreciated their honesty and intrepidity as pioneers of a new colonization.

We have already seen<sup>3</sup> how the land was parcelled out by the seigneurs and the consequent more or less friendly association between him and his tenants. The seigneurial tenure carried with it certain privileges and rights which must be noted here more particularly if we would understand this source of external influence on the language. In the very first conveyance of land to a colonist—father of the Hébert family, whose acquaintance we have already made—we find traces of the *Coutumes de Paris*, which was the law before the civil tribunals established at Quebec, Montreal and Three Rivers. This was in 1626, and it was not till nearly four decades (1663<sup>4</sup>) later that the principle became established for the whole country by the first *concession en fief* made to Robert

<sup>1</sup> Discours sur l'Instruction Publique en Canada prononcé à la Convention canadienne de 1874.

<sup>2</sup> Francis Parkman, *The Old Régime in Canada*, p. 381.

<sup>3</sup> *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. VI, p. 148.

<sup>4</sup> At the beginning of this year, it will be remembered, the Company of the Hundred Associates (noticed below), in a resolution signed by fifteen of its members, "a arrêté que . . . serait fait une démission entre les mains de Sa Majesté, de la propriété et seigneurie du dit pays (la Nouvelle-France) appartenant à la dite Compagnie, pour en disposer par Sa Majesté comme il lui plaira, se rapportant à son équité et bonne justice, d'accorder un dédommagement proportionné aux dépenses que la dite Compagnie a faites pour le bien et l'avantage du dit pays."—*Édits et Ordonnances Royaux*, Vol. I, p. 30.

Giffard, Seigneur de Beauport. This period must be kept in mind, as in it the form of government in Canada began to shape itself definitely, and the feudal *régime* was saddled upon the colonist to the exclusion of all other species of political and social polity. The year following the first private land-grant (1627) a contract was signed between Richelieu and the Compagnie des Cents Associés (or de la Nouvelle-France) in virtue of which the latter were to enjoy the colony "à perpétuité, en toute propriété, justice et seigneurie."

This edict is of special interest for us, since in the very first article of agreement it is stipulated that this Company shall transport to Canada, beginning with the next year (1628), three hundred men of all professions, and shall increase this number to four thousand men and women in the succeeding fifteen years; and again, in Section IV of the same, in order to recompense the Company for its great expense in this enterprise, the extraordinary grant is mentioned, as just given, of "le fort et habitation de Québec avec tout le dit pays de la Nouvelle-France, dite Canada, tant le long des côtes depuis la Floride . . . jusqu'au cercle arctique," etc. Besides many other special rights and privileges, this all-powerful Association had for these fifteen years the exclusive control of the fur-trade (Article VII); all sorts of merchandise and products of industry coming from it were to be free of duty (Article XIV), and twelve *lettres de noblesse* were issued for such leading members and their families (to be continued to their descendants forever) as did not belong to this rank in the native country (Article XIV). Here we have, then, the supreme power of government vested in a corporation whose dissolution (1663) was the natural outcome of the greed and abuse of privilege that followed so unrestricted a control of the material interests of this immense territory. But another significant feature of this legal document must not be overlooked—namely, the preliminary statement that the King, wishing to perpetuate the memory and holy purpose of Henri-le-Grand, would strive, with divine assistance, to bring the inhabitants of New France to a knowledge of the true God by having them instructed and trained in the "religion catholique, apostolique et romaine"; and Monseigneur le Cardinal de Richelieu was of opinion that the only means of disposing these savages to the Christian faith was to people the country with Catholics, native of France. Thus was introduced into this scheme of colonization that distinct religious coloring which manifested

itself throughout the brief reign of the Company so decidedly as to stamp it with the characteristic appellation, "mission-period."

This was the charter, then, that established feudal tenure throughout Canada, and it was to cut short the abuses that had arisen under its exclusive and exceptional provisions that the Minister of Louis XIII annulled it and made the following new effort at colonization. On the breaking up of this old colonial "Committee of a Hundred," a Royal Council held sway for a year, composed of a Governor, the highest tributary ecclesiastic of the country, the Intendant and five Councillors. This Council was endued with the same power as that borne by the sovereign court of France, but it was yet too early to rule the colony exclusively by home dictation, and there was consequently no time lost in supplanting it by an organization whose influence was drawn in great measure from its vested interests.

Almost exactly a year after the edict was issued (April, 1663) for the creation of the *conseil souverain*, came the establishment (May, 1664) of the Compagnie des Indes Occidentales, whose powers, privileges and immunities were even greater than those of its predecessor, the Compagnie du Canada. After reciting many breaches of trust, failures to comply with the stipulations of their charter, and other irregularities on the part of this corporation, it is stated to be the intention of His Majesty, in order properly to carry on the commerce of the West Indies, to establish a powerful company, to which he would concede these islands, "celles de Cayenne et de toute la terre ferme de l'Amérique . . . , le Canada, l'Acadie, Isle de Terreneuve et autres isles et terre ferme, depuis le nord du dit pays de Canada jusqu'à la Virginie et Floride, ensemble toute la côte de l'Afrique depuis le Cap Vert jusqu'au Cap de Bonne Espérance."<sup>1</sup> This company was to be composed especially of those possessing landed property in the regions indicated, and of others who were desirous to join in the development of home-commerce with these foreign parts; and the term of their grant was much more favorable than that of their forerunners, the Hundred Associates, since they were conceded the exclusive privilege of commerce and navigation for forty years, while the latter were shut off originally with but fifteen years, though the existence of this first corporation was finally extended to about the same length of time as that of their more fortunate followers.

But this new ruling power, thus constituted, apparently the

<sup>1</sup> *Édits et Ordonnances*, Vol. I, p. 40.

special outgrowth of a desire to foster commerce, was not to be confined to the promotion of material interests. A higher purpose is professed in the introductory stipulation, where the same strong religious motive for colonization of the New World is expressed in definite terms: "Comme nous regardons dans l'établissement des dites colonies principalement la gloire de Dieu en procurant le salut des Indiens et Sauvages, auxquels nous désirons faire connoître la vraie religion, la dite compagnie présentement établie sous le nom de 'Compagnie des Indes Occidentales' sera obligée de faire passer aux pays ci-dessus concédés le nombre d'ecclésiastiques nécessaire pour y prêcher le Saint Évangile et instruire ces peuples en la créance de la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine," etc.

In the mode of its organization, however, a striking contrast with that of its predecessor is evident at the first glance, and the pronounced tendency to centralized authority is manifest which soon after developed in France with reference to the government of her colonies and caused the overthrow of this company, to which so much power had originally been given. I allude to Section VIII of their charter, wherein it was specially stipulated that a Board of General Directors, consisting of nine persons, should be established at Paris, and these directors should name the commanding officers (Section XIII) and the clerks necessary for the service of the Company, both at home and abroad. But a still greater innovation on the system of preceding companies, and a feature that specially concerns us here, is the formal introduction (Section XXXIII) of the *Coutume de Paris*: "Seront . . . tenus . . . les officiers de suivre et se conformer à la Coutume de la prévôté et vicomté de Paris, suivant laquelle les habitans pourront contracter sans que l'on y puisse introduire aucune coutume pour éviter la diversité."

But scarcely a decade had passed after the cession of the enormous possessions mentioned above to the West India Company, before we find their charter suddenly revoked by royal edict, and from this time (1674) until the conquest (1760) the Royal Council held exclusive sway. Thus we see the various attempts of the home government to properly rule her colonies on the St. Lawrence were abortive until it assumed the control of them to the exclusion of all private claims to authority, whether by extensive and potent companies or by individuals. In this struggle on the part of the State finally to concentrate within herself the sole jurisdiction of her colonial possessions, instead of delegating it to a

corporation that managed these possessions for the advantage of the interested few, we have sundry forms of local legislation introduced, various social customs developed, and diverse relations established between lord and peasant that are of importance in consideration of the language of rulers and ruled. For while the main tenor of his life was feudalistic, the *habitant* of New France spurned certain duties that were regarded as essential prerogatives of his master in the Old World. Such, for example, was that important feature of feudalism during the heyday of its supremacy —namely, military service, and which was totally unknown in Canada. And just here it may be well to note more particularly a few points in which, through feudal custom, these two elements of society were brought into friendly contact.

The seigneur himself, though naturally upon a footing, with reference to his sovereign, more free in this foreign land than at home, yet had to give evidence every year of his subjection by rendering homage to the king's representative at Quebec, by repeating the oath of allegiance and performing certain other formalities that were required by his royal monarch. He was obliged to acknowledge the right of *quint*, by which a fifth part of the price for any land sold went to the king; but, besides these requirements—and what concerns us especially—he was bound by the *droit de banalité* to build grist-mills on his estate for the use of his tenants. We read in an edict of June 4, 1686, touching these *moulins banaux*:<sup>1</sup> "Le roi étant en son conseil, ayant été informé que la plupart des seigneurs qui possèdent des fiefs dans son pays de la Nouvelle-France négligent de bâtir des moulins banaux nécessaires pour la subsistance des habitans du dit pays, et voulant pourvoir à un défaut si préjudiciable à l'entretien de la colonie, Sa Majesté étant en son conseil, a ordonné et ordonne que tous les seigneurs qui possèdent des fiefs dans l'étendue du dit pays de la Nouvelle-France seront tenus d'y faire construire des moulins banaux dans le tems d'une année après la publication du présent arrêt, et le dit tems passé, faute par eux d'y avoir satisfait, permet Sa Majesté à tous particuliers, de quelque qualité et condition qu'ils soient, de bâtir les dits moulins, leur en attribuant à cette fin le droit de banalité, faisant défenses à toutes personnes de les y troubler."

Before this edict the *banalité* was purely conventional, as it was

<sup>1</sup> Édits, Ordonnances Royaux, Déclarations et Arrêts du Conseil D'État du Roi concernant le Canada, Vol. I, p. 255.

in France, where it did not fall under the cognizance of the common law. The *censitaire* (tenant), on the other hand, was compelled also to have his grinding done at the mill of his seigneur, paying him, as toll for it, the fourteenth part; he was required to bake his bread in the seigneurial oven, to work at least one day in the year for his lord, and to give him one fish in every eleven that he took in that part of the river flowing by his domain.

The seigneur in France, furthermore, was absolute master over his estate, and could rent it or not, as he wished; but not so in Canada. Here, according to a royal decree of June 4, 1675, concessions too large to be peopled and handled by their owners to the advantage of the country had to be given up to new colonists: "Le roi ayant été informé que tous ses sujets qui ont passé de l'ancienne en la Nouvelle-France, ont obtenu des concessions d'une très grande quantité de terre le long des rivières du dit pays, lesquelles ils n'ont pu défricher à cause de la trop grande étendue, ce qui incommode les autres habitants du dit pays, et même empêche que d'autres François n'y passent pour s'y habiter, ce qui étant entièrement contraire aux intentions de Sa Majesté pour le dit pays et à l'application qu'elle a bien voulu donner depuis huit ou dix années pour augmenter les colonies qui y sont établies, attendu qu'il ne se trouve qu'une partie des terres le long des rivières cultivées, le reste ne l'étant point et ne pouvant l'être à cause de la trop grand étendue des dites concessions et de la foiblesse des propriétaires d'icelles, à quoi étant nécessaire de pourvoir, Sa Majesté étant en son conseil a ordonné et ordonne que par le Sieur Duchesneau, conseiller en son conseil et intendant de la justice, police et finances au dit pays, il sera fait une déclaration précise et exacte de la qualité des terres concédées aux principaux habitans du dit pays, du nombre d'arpens ou autre mesure usitée<sup>1</sup> du dit pays qu'elles contiennent sur le bord des rivières et au dedans des terres, du nombre de personnes et de bestiaux employés à la culture et au défrichement d'icelles; en conséquence de laquelle déclaration la moitié des terres qui avoient été concédées auparavant les dix dernières années, et qui ne se trouveront défrichées et cultivées en terres labourables ou en prés, sera retranchée des concessions et donnée aux particuliers qui se présenteront pour les cultiver et les défricher."<sup>1</sup>

This condition, imposed on the seigneur to clear his land within a limited time on pain of forfeiting it, has been regarded as the

<sup>1</sup> *Édits et Ordonnances*, Vol. I, pp. 81, 82.

distinctive feature of Canadian feudalism. The same centralization of power, furthermore, which we have just seen in the hands of officers of the home government at the time of the dissolution of the West India Company, is clearly illustrated by the relation which the vassal proprietor held in New France to his rulers. The crown (contrary to feudal usages in France proper) maintained a strict control over not only his dealings with the State, but also his private contracts and enterprises. "A decree of the king, an edict of the council, or an ordinance of the intendant, might at any moment change old conditions, impose new ones, interfere between the lord of the manor and his grantees and modify or annul his bargains, past or present."<sup>1</sup> In a letter of the Marquis de Beauharnois, the Governor, to the Minister, in 1734, the bold doctrine is laid down that, "as His Majesty gives the land for nothing, he can make what conditions he pleases and change them when he pleases."<sup>2</sup> These interventions, it should be noted, were usually favorable to the *censitaire*.

And again, about half a century later (March 15, 1732), another act of the home authorities provides that those seigneuries which had remained uncleared and unoccupied should revert to the crown at the expiration of one year from the date of this Arrêt: "Le roi s'étant fait représenter en son conseil l'arrêt rendu en icelui le six juillet, mil sept cent onze, portant que les habitans de la Nouvelle-France, auxquels il auroit été accordé des terres en seigneuries, qui n'y auroient pas de domaines défrichés ni d'habitans établis, seroient tenus de les mettre en culture et d'y placer des habitans dans un an du jour de la publication du dit arrêt, passé lequel tems elles demeureroient réunies au domaine de Sa Majesté."<sup>3</sup>

The *censitaire* having once taken possession, his seigneur could not exact anything from him except the two sous per acre allowed by law for rent, unless the land changed owners, in which case the seigneur had his *lods et vents*, an impost of one-twelfth part of the value of the farm. These *lods et vents*, together with the *banalité* just noted, constituted the principal income of the lord; but it must not be supposed that he always led a life of ease or that his family lived in luxury. In truth, the domestic habits of his family during the above-named mission-period were extremely simple. We have the testimony of one of the king's agents, the intendant Denonville,

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, *Old Régime*, p. 248.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 251.

<sup>3</sup> *Édits et Ordonnances*, Vol. I, p. 531.

who asserts, in a letter to the Minister bearing date Nov. 10, 1686, that he had seen "two young ladies, daughters of Monsieur de Saint-Ours, a gentleman of Dauphiny, reaping grain and at the plow-tail." The dowry of Magdeleine Boucher, sister of the Governor of Three Rivers, a seigneur, was set down by an author of the middle of the seventeenth century as follows: "Two hundred francs cash, four sheets, two table-cloths, six linen pieces, a mattress and coverlet, two dishes, six spoons and six pewter plates, a saucepan and a copper kettle, a table and two benches, a kneading-trough, a trunk with lock and key, a cow and two mated pigs." But we know that the Bouchers were a family of distinction, that the bride's dowry answered to her station; and in another case, the parents of the bride bind themselves to present the bridegroom with a barrel of bacon when the ships come in from France.<sup>1</sup>

We have thus abundant proof that these young women of the *haute noblesse* helped freely in the domestic duties of the household, and also that the noble lord personally superintended his laborers in the field. The celebrated Swedish botanist already mentioned, Kalm, a man of keen observation, gives us some sketches from life of the manners and customs of the Canadians: "They [the women] are not averse to taking part in all the business of housekeeping, and I have with pleasure seen the daughters of the better sort of people, and of the Governor [of Montreal] himself, not too finely dressed and going into kitchens and cellars, to look that everything be done as it ought."<sup>2</sup>

Here we have, then, in the primary conditions of Canadian society, irrespective of the clergy, of educational institutions and of other organizations where an educated element predominated—namely, the charity foundations—causes all-powerful to produce a drift in one general direction—that is, toward a uniformity of language such as had not been known in the mother-country. In this calculation, it will be observed, we have left out of the account that special levelling agency which must exist in every new community cut off, as the Canadian settlements were, from all personal intercourse with the home-people. They felt the necessity of strong union and co-operation in battling with the savages about them, and hence were bound together with much stronger mutual

<sup>1</sup> Atlantic Monthly, Vol. XLVIII, p. 774. *Contrat de Mariage*, cited by Ferland, Notes, p. 73. Cf. also Parkman, *The Old Régime in Canada*, p. 382.

<sup>2</sup> Kalm, *Travels in North America*, translated into English by John Reinhold Forster (London, 1771); quoted by Parkman, *The Old Régime*, p. 390.

influences than they would have been in more propitious circumstances.

But all of these social conditions and peculiar political relations put together must have been of little moment in reforming and ameliorating the various speech-varieties of the Canadian folk compared with influences brought to bear upon them by the clergy, by the members, male and female, of those numerous Church establishments of the various religious corporations, organized by private munificence, devoted to the instruction of the young and to the spreading and strengthening of the Catholic faith.

We have already observed that the whole Canadian society rests upon a religious basis, that the priest has such a grasp upon the confidence of the common people that his spiritual authority is unquestioned and his dicta seldom go unheeded. He is not a mere figurehead behind which Society moves in devious routes and is shielded in its malpractices by the emblem of sanctimonious power, but a living presence whose force is always felt to be the most important, the most extensive and the most potent social factor in every community. To have so universal a hold on the sympathies of any people, these representatives of the Church must not only have proved themselves worthy of their calling by their devotion, self-sacrifice and godly life, but they must necessarily have controlled the early education of their people. And this brings us to a consideration of the last and most cogent force of a purely external nature that helped to abrade the dialect-irregularities and reduce to a homogeneous state the structure, forms and sound of the Canadian language.

Jacques Cartier took priests along with him on his first two voyages to the New World, but there is no evidence that they were able to impart instruction to the savages. The first evangelizer of New France, in fact, was M. Jessé Flèche, who baptized in 1610, at Port Royal, the family of an Indian chief. He was followed the next year by some Jesuits, who immediately began missions; but it was not till 1616 that the first veritable attempts at instruction were made, when the Récollet Fathers undertook to teach the elements of reading and writing to a few children of the natives. At the head of these was Frère Duplessis, who opened a school at Three Rivers, and who must be considered the forerunner of that great army of devoted and self-sacrificing men who have ever kept the fire burning on the altar of knowledge in Canada. The Récollets called the Jesuits to Quebec in 1625, but only four

years later they all returned to France when Quebec fell into the hands of the English. On the restoration of the country to the French in 1632, two Jesuit Fathers, Lejeune and Lalemant, followed De Caen across the seas, and while the former devoted himself to the instruction of the natives, the latter, for the first time in the history of the colony, gave regular formal instruction to the children of the whites. This effort must have met with immediate response on the part of the people, since only five years later we find them erecting a college which afterward became of great importance to the community, and consequently to this date (1637) must be assigned the serious beginning of public instruction in Canada. Two years later Mme. de la Peltrie and the celebrated Mère Marie de l'Incarnation, whom Bossuet calls the St. Theresa of the New World, established in the same town the Ursuline convent, which was the first school for girls in the whole of New France. To the former of these noble ladies were due the inception of the scheme, and the funds to carry it out, of educating the female children of the Indians; but to the latter must be mainly attributed the success of the enterprise. She united an almost ecstatic fervor to practical talents of the highest order. Incited and supported by supernatural dreams and visions, her indomitable energy overcame all discouragement. In the vision she had while praying before the Sacrament at Tours before she entered on her work, the whole land of Canada was shown her, rugged with primeval forest, and the memory of the heavenly voice which sent her on her mission supported her under all her trials.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, Maisonneuve, the founder and Governor of Montreal, began to look for the introduction of similar educational benefits into the Ville Marie colony, and a few years later brought there la Sœur Marguerite Bourgeois, organizer in the New World of the Congrégation de Notre Dame. The story of the founding of Montreal is fresh with all that spirit which permeated and ruled the whole civilization of French Canada, which placed the learned and the unlearned, the nobleman and plebeian, the priest and the people, upon the same footing of Christian fellowship, and made each individual community a centre of united and vigorous missionary effort.<sup>2</sup> Parkman has traced with characteristic coloring and graphic effect the landing of Maisonneuve and the taking possession of the wilderness: "Maisonneuve sprang ashore and fell

<sup>1</sup> Dawson, *Handbook for the Dominion of Canada*, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> The *Jesuits in North America*, p. 208.

on his knees. His followers imitated his example, and all joined their voices in enthusiastic songs of thanksgiving. An altar was raised on a pleasant spot near at hand, and Mademoiselle Mance, with Madame de la Peltrie, decorated it with a taste which was the admiration of the beholders. Now all the company gathered before the shrine. They knelt in reverent silence as the Host was raised aloft; and when the rite was over, the priest turned and addressed them: 'You are a grain of mustard-seed that shall rise and grow till its branches overshadow the earth. You are few, but your work is the work of God. His smile is on you, and your children shall fill the land.'

In 1653 Marguerite Bourgeois gave all her property to the poor and came out to Canada with Maisonneuve—his second voyage—expressly to establish an institution for the education of the female children of the French settlers and of the savage nations of Canada. She was not born of noble family, but she had in an eminent degree that nobility which no written parchments can bestow, flowing from a heart humble and yet brave, earnestly religious and yet with a quiet enthusiasm. "To this day," says Parkman, "in crowded schoolrooms of Montreal and Quebec, fit monuments of her unobtrusive virtue, her successors instruct the children of the poor and embalm the pleasant memory of Marguerite Bourgeois."<sup>1</sup> She first taught the children of the Governor's family; but she had been in the country only a few years when she established (1657) a school in a stable which she had turned into a sort of school-house; but from this humble beginning there soon followed most brilliant results, since we find, in less than a century, that the *religieuses* of this Order had a dozen educational institutions of more or less importance scattered throughout the principal parishes of the colony.<sup>2</sup>

Only a month after the title of the Hundred Associates was extinguished, Mgr. de Laval established at Quebec the Grand Séminaire, and four or five years later the Petit Séminaire, from which two institutions sprang up, in 1852, as an integral part of them, the celebrated Université Laval.

A decade and a half (1647) before Quebec was provided with these institutions of learning, the Sulpitians at Montreal founded their celebrated seminary, which exists to-day as one of the most

<sup>1</sup> Dawson, *Handbook*, p. 217.—Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America*, p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> Chauveau, *L'Instruction Publique au Canada*, p. 50 seq.—De Cazes, *Notes sur le Canada*, p. 130 seq.

important educational establishments of the city, and still keeps its original, double aim of carrying on theological training for priests and of teaching the secular youth. The story of the origin of this institution appropriately illustrates the character of all the early establishments of education in New France, and explains many of the characteristic peculiarities of the present public education in the Province of Quebec. It was the year following the death (1635) of Champlain, the founder of French nationality in Canada, which was also the date of starting the Three Rivers colony and of establishing the first college of Jesuits in New France, that the Abbé Olier, a zealous priest, while praying in the Church of St. Germain des Prés in Paris, thought he received a divine revelation to found upon the island of Montreal a society of priests for the propagation of the true faith in the New World. Led by various mystical guidings, he formed the acquaintance of Dauversière, a receiver of taxes in Anjou, whose mind had been prepared in a similar manner. These two men resolved to found upon the island three religious orders—one of priests, to preach the true faith; another of nuns, to nurse the sick; and a third, also of nuns, to educate the young. The dream of these enthusiasts is to-day realized in the Seminary of St. Sulpice, the Hospital of the Hôtel-Dieu, and the schools of the Congregation of Notre Dame. Through the aid of a member of the nobility they purchased in 1640 the seigniory of the island of Montreal, and then, finding a suitable leader in Maisonneuve, they sent out a colony to found the city in 1642; and just a decade and a half later the celebrated seminary was established under the direction of the Abbé de Quélus, who had come to Montreal to carry out Olier's views.<sup>1</sup> In the archives of the Province we find the concession of a great part of the island of Montreal to the "Gentlemen of the Seminary," as they are called, under date of Dec. 17, 1640, and on Feb. 13, 1644, the ratification of the same, signed "Louis."<sup>2</sup>

The origin and earliest history of these few institutions are quite sufficient to show what their character was, and they have not changed even to this day in their purpose and dominant tendencies. Just as the Récollet Fathers in 1615 and the Jesuits in 1625 threw themselves into the missionary work, encouraged by Champlain and other leaders, so in the dark period for the French in Canada when English sway bore upon them and threatened to tear away

<sup>1</sup> Dawson, *Handbook for the Dominion of Canada*, p. 210.

<sup>2</sup> *Édits, Ordonnances Royaux, etc.*, Vol. I, pp. 20-26.

from them their language and their religion and the public schools were closed because they were Catholic, the clergy again came to the rescue, and through their indomitable perseverance, their sympathy for the people, and their religious enthusiasm, raised them to a level of higher social life and united them in their efforts against the common enemy. It was in these trying circumstances, just after the conquest, when nearly all their temporal leaders had abandoned them and fled the country, that the people grouped themselves more closely than ever about their priests and bishops, loyal to the traditions of their race; and as they had learned from the press of outward circumstances to unite their forces against savage nations, now they held together about their spiritual leaders, learning from them many of their social ways, adopting their expressions, their grammar-usages and, in fine, their language. This assimilating process naturally went on in both directions, especially for the clergy who were sent out from the mother-country; that is, the clergy gave up some of their possessions and the people surrendered a part of theirs. It is particularly the phonology, the mode of pronunciation, that the people have clung to and perpetuated with a striking fidelity, while in the morphology of the language evidence is constantly at hand of the very strong influence of the clergy—that is, of the educated element of society. Their influence, through their schools, has so thoroughly penetrated the masses that one finds now an extraordinary uniformity of speech through this whole extent of French territory. The people have held their pronunciation everywhere, and the educated classes, with few exceptions, make use of it even among themselves. This is true not only of native Canadians, but also generally of the members of the clergy born and educated in France, many of whom find a home on the St. Lawrence. A few years only suffice for them to cast aside the Parisian accent and use with fluency the composite vocalization of the common folk about them.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

## II.—THE CONSECUTIVE SENTENCE IN GREEK.

In the preface to the third volume of his *Kunstformen* (p. xxvi), Dr. J. H. H. Schmidt, after enlarging on the benefits to be derived from the study of rhythm and from the study of synonyms, and after anticipating a large accession to classical culture from these two sources, tells us that this culture will ignore the difference between *ωστε* with the inf. and *ωστε* with the finite verb—a distinction which is due simply to dexterous mental manipulation in the teeth of the facts. It will ignore many other rules of the grammar of the day, but it will have its roots in truth and in life.<sup>1</sup>

Fifteen years have passed since then, and the problems of grammar still exercise the investigator as well as the hapless schoolboy. The practical end of such investigations should be to get rid of these grammatical troubles by sharp and simple formulae, whether positive or negative, in order to give time for the new life that has come, and that is to come, through the study of artistic form, through the study of the thesaurus of antique expression. Much has been done in this direction, much remains to be done; but, in any case, I am opposed to loading the memory of young students with a mass of minute syntactical rules. The formula of my own work for beginners has been for years: "Maximum of Forms, Minimum of Syntax, Early Contact with the Language in Mass." What the young student has to learn in syntax is the necessary differentiation of Latin and Greek from the native tongue. When the form carries the syntax, syntax is needless. When the two horses run side by side, the beginner should be content to ride behind them and not attempt to ride astride them. That feat should be reserved for a later period of syntactical equestrianism. So, for instance, with the general freedom of participle in English and participle in Greek, the study of the latter belongs to style rather than to grammar proper, and, apart from the ascertainment of those principles that simplify the acquisition and the handling of the language, the great attraction of syntactical research in

<sup>1</sup> Diese Cultur wird nicht mehr den Unterschied des *ωστε* cum infinitivo und des *ωστε* cum verbo finito kennen, den man im grellen Widersprüche mit den Thatsachen herausgeklügelt hat, und so noch viele andere Regeln der heutigen Grammatik; aber sie wird in der Wahrheit und im Leben wurzeln.

Greek lies in the artistic beauty that it reveals. If syntax is not to be made available for the appreciation of form, we need much less of it than we have in our grammars; if it is, as I believe, a potent factor, and, which is more, a measurable factor in style, we know far too little of it; and while the gain from the close study of synonyms will, I grant, be incalculable, still, the results of syntactical research for a like delicate appreciation of idiom are sufficient to encourage the hope that I have more than once expressed—that all syntax may become a *syntaxis ornata*, and that the minute statistic by which we try to replace the effect of native contact with the language may be tributary to the artistic appreciation of the most artistic of literatures—a literature that has been fashioned by processes of which critics of modern written art are just becoming dimly conscious.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Schmidt's selection of *ωτε* as a specimen of the futility of the approved grammars made a deep impression on me at the time. Every teacher of Greek has to encounter the problem as a practical one. The boy must be taught that there is a difference between *ωτε* with the ind. and *ωτε* with the inf., or that there is no difference. If there is a difference, the rule has to be supplemented by the statement that the rule is sometimes asleep with a sleep that resembles death. If there is no difference, then we have to encounter a very marked divergency in the use of the negative—such divergency always recalling a fundamental difference of conception. The only practical solution discernible is to insist on the difference which our own language presents between 'so... as' and 'so... that,' and to maintain that 'so... that' for 'so... as' is not a translation of *ωτε* with the inf., but only an accommodation to more common usage. The English language coincides with the Greek to a certain extent; the differentiation is only one of

<sup>1</sup> See Grammar and Aesthetics, Princeton Review, May, 1883, p. 307. Theodore Watts says: "We believe that the time is not far distant when even such a subject as vowel-composition (the arrangement of one vowel-sound with regard to another) will have to be studied with the care which the Greeks evidently bestowed upon it" (Encyc. Brit., 9 ed., XIX 273). In a remarkable essay on Style in Literature, in the Contemporary Review for April, 1885, p. 548, Robert Louis Stevenson writes of the technic of composition as if he were fresh from the school of Dionysios of Halikarnassos, though the essay bears every mark of independent thought; and, as another illustration of the drift of literary criticism, see an article by E. R. Sill in the Atlantic Monthly for Nov., 1885, p. 673. To those who are familiar with the treatises of the Greek rhetoricians much of our modern aesthetic criticism seems elementary.

more and less. In German the state of things is different. In Latin the state of things is different. German has, so to speak, no *ωστε* with the infinitive. It uses 'so dass' for both Greek constructions. Latin has no strict equivalent for *ωστε* with indic., and uses its equivalent for *ωστε* with inf. (*ut* with subj.) for both Greek constructions. Hence, in these two languages, a certain expenditure of metaphysics, of what Dr. Schmidt calls 'herausklügeln'—an expenditure practically unnecessary in English.

But, of course, it will be said that translation is no proof, and, if it be a proof, that we simply substitute *y* for *x* by putting the so-called English infinitive in the place of the Greek infinitive. Doubtless the difficulties are great, and the student of Greek syntax will be disposed to welcome new light on the subject, whether it come from a closer and sharper consideration of the conditions, or a more methodical and complete array of facts. The most recent treatise that has reached me is the elaborate dissertation of Dr. Seume, which seems to deserve especial mention.<sup>1</sup> Beginning with a summary for my own use, and advancing to an abstract without criticism for the review department of the Journal, I have finally interwoven criticism and suggestion so freely that the article may, perhaps, claim of right the position which it occupies in these pages as a contribution to the discussion of the troublesome consecutive sentence.

The problem is one of those that elude, by their very nature, the grasp of the most determined Proteus-catcher.

The conception of consecution itself, the shifting function of the infinitive, the oscillation of the leading particle *ωστε*, are enough, single or combined, to perplex the student who tries either the analytical or the historical method, or both. The notion of finality, of will, is plainly set forth in language; the notion of causality lies outside of language, and is a mere inference. The notion of consequence arises in different ways in different languages. Juxtaposition suggests it. Comparison suggests it. Every one who has looked into a Hebrew grammar knows what a momentous part the consecutive relation plays there, and how slight, apparently, is the external indication. In Greek, finality begins it and comparison ends it, and two forms develop—one for tendency, the other for result—and yet, as it would seem, the inference of result is often so irresistible that the mind goes beyond the formal limit and

<sup>1</sup> De sententiis consecutivis Graecis. Scripsit HERMANNUS SEUME. Gottingae, MDCCCLXXXIII.

attaches the notion of result to an expression which commits itself to nothing more than tendency. The English 'so as to' is transmuted into 'so that'; the Latin *ut* with subj. outgoes its potential form, if it be a potential form; the Greek *ωστε* with inf. produces, at least on some of our best grammarians, an impression hardly to be distinguished from that of *ωστε* with indic. Thus we import into the combination what does not lie in the elements; but, as that is done everywhere in language, all that the investigator has to show is that our conception of the relation is also the Greek conception. That is all, but that all is a great deal. Between 'so as to' and 'so that' stands, as has been intimated, the warning negative. So long as *μή* continues to keep alive the true infinitive, so long must we recognize the difference between tendency and result—tendency being an outgrowth of finality, result lying at times implied in tendency, yet never coincident with it. If the infinitive is a dative, and a dative only, then the problem is somewhat simplified. Then the infinitive gives the end for which, the personal element which is necessary for final expression fades out, and adaptation is used as harmlessly as a Darwinian uses it, who has no teleology in all his thoughts, though in language, as in human nature, teleology is indefeasible. If, however, there is a local element in the inf., we have a similar trouble to that which arises with the supine in *-u*, which, so far as the form is concerned, may be explained on the theory of the pure dative, the locative, or the pure ablative.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The explanation which refers the supine in *-u* to the dat. (see f. i., Schmalz, §90) has much in its favor, but what right have we to call the clear abl. in Cato and Plautus (§102 Anm. 1) an unsuccessful extension? Why may it not be a survival? Livy has (31, 38) *id DICTU quam RE facilius*. Concinnity would surely seem to require the same case throughout, although that is not to be insisted on. By the way, Schmalz's excellent treatise gives us no help as to the consecutive sentence in Latin. We read (§285): "Das Konsecutiv *ut* wird immer mit dem Konj. verbunden; dies kommt daher weil nur durch den Konj. im Nebensatz ausgedrückt werden kann, dass der letztere die Handlung nach den sie begleitenden oder ihr folgenden Umständen bedingt." The subj. is necessary, then, because the subj. alone can show that the dependent clause conditions the action according to the circumstances that attend or follow the action. This is, to my mind, nothing but verbiage for 'contingency.' 'The subj. is necessary because the notion is that of contingency.' In other words, the consecutive sentence does not express fact, but eventuality. The limitations of *qui* with the subj. in a so-called final sense do point to the potential rather than to the final conception, and the potential subj. (= opt. + *āv*) does explain the sequence of tenses after *ut* consecutive better than the final,

A still greater complication arises from the introduction of *ωστε*. It comes in apparently as a reinforcement of the inf. at a time when the inf. is beginning to fade into an acc., just as 'for' in English is introduced to reinforce the fading dat. sense of our supine inf. *ωστε* with inf. is post-Homeric, and does not belong to the original apparatus; but we should expect to find the germs of the use in Homer, and certainly we should look to Homer for the distinction between *ως* and *ωστε*, on which so much turns. We should look to Homer for the explanation of the remarkable fact that *ωστε* is normal and *ως* abnormal in the consecutive sentence. Unfortunately, the differentiating *τε* is by no means reducible to that homely test of comprehension, that first step to understanding, translation. When *τε* occurs in prose as a copulative particle we know what to do with it. Alone or in couples it is *-que*. 'As'—'so' or 'so (too)' will fairly provide for it. But the force eludes us in *τε* and in *δτε*, though *δτε* might be rendered 'whenas.' In Homer *τε* is a pervasive trouble. Is it a vocal gesture, a 'there,' a *da?* Does it serve to generalize, as many Homeric scholars maintain, and so set off the particularizing *δν*, which in its turn was to become a generalizer in prose? How far down is this generalizing force felt? Was *ωστε* to Pindar, for example, anything but an old-fashioned *ως*? Let us take a familiar form of the problem. What is the difference between *οἰος* and *οἰός τε*? Is it really too elusive to be fixed? George Eliot's 'Theophrastus Such' was a puzzle to those—there are too many—who had not read Theophrastus himself. 'Such' is taken from Theophrastus. Each character of Theophrastus contains in the opening sentence *οἰος*—*e.g.*, *οὐδὲ περίεργος τοιοῦτός τις οἰος ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι ἀναστὰς ἢ μὴ δυνήσεται*. Can we substitute for this *οἰος τε*? No. *οἰος* has to do with 'character,' *οἰός τε* with 'circumstance' rather; *οἰος* is 'disposition,' *οἰός τε* 'position' merely. A man may be capable of murder (*οἰος*), he may not be in a situation to commit the crime (*οἰός τε*). There are passages that seem to contradict this distinction, long since indicated by Harpokration, who says: *οἰος εἰ σημαίνει τὸ βούλει καὶ προήρησται, τὸ δὲ οἰός τε εἰ τὸ δύνασται*. But sometimes emendation is suggested, sometimes 'position' and 'disposition' coincide. If there is any virtue in it, however, it may help us to understand why *ωστε* is preferred

to say nothing of the negative *non*. Still it is not necessary that *ut* and *qui* should have the same sphere any more than *ως* and *οἰς*. *ως* final has the subj., *οἰς* final the fut. indic. or the opt. with *δν*, and when we look at the teleology that lies in *natus ad*, *accommodatus*, *aptus ad*, we may well pause.

to  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ . It may show that  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  is really used to reduce finality to consecution, the adaptation which lies in character being more distinctly final than that which lies in circumstances. But it is high time to turn from the statement of the problem to the summary of Dr. Seume's dissertation. First he surveys the various theories as to  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ : Gayler's  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon = itaque, et ita$ , which he dismisses with contempt as utterly impotent to explain the inf.; Hand's *gleichwie*, which was afterwards modified so as to make  $\tau\epsilon = da$ , in which latter view he has been followed by Wentzel. Hartung makes  $\tau\epsilon = \tau\omega$  and  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon = so dass$ . Klotz identifies  $\tau\epsilon$  with  $\tau\omega$ ,  $\omega\sigma$  being  $= ut$ ,  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon = ut quodam modo$ . Years before, G. Hermann had translated  $-\tau\epsilon$  in  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  and the like by *ferme, fere, nimirum*, although he acknowledges an over-translation, Ger. *ja*.  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  is *qui omnino, qui quoquo modo rem spectas*. Kvičala makes  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  *der irgend, welcher irgend*, which gradually becomes exaggerated into *qui-cunque, wer auch immer*, or flattened into an equivalence with the simple  $\omega\sigma$ . A similar bifurcation is to be expected for  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ ; but while Seume considers the indefinite nature of  $-\tau\epsilon$  to have been made out, he is not disposed to accept the stronger *wie nur immer* signification for the consecutive  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ , which is, as every one knows, post-Homeric, the only two passages in Homer being Il. 9, 42; Od. 17, 21. By the time  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  had got into use as a consecutive particle, the feeling for the  $-\tau\epsilon$  had perished—as it had perished in  $\delta\tau\epsilon$ ,  $\tau\omega\tau\epsilon$  and the like—and  $\omega\sigma$  and  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  were equivalents. A common-sense conclusion; and yet who will say that  $\delta\tau\epsilon$  might not have been felt as 'whenas'? who will say that there is no difference whatever between  $\omega\sigma\omega\sigma$  and  $\omega\sigma\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ ? who will explain away the prevalence of  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  over its equivalent  $\omega\sigma$ ? Strange are the tenacities of language! As for the explanation which despatches  $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  as equivalent to *et is, atque is*, I must frankly say that it ignores the difficulties that arise from the large use of  $\tau\epsilon$  in other connections, of which a list can be seen in any Homeric lexicon. To call  $\tau\epsilon$  a copulative conjunction only postpones the explanation. Delbrück, who, in his *Synt. Forsch.* I 51, declines to consider the source of its copulative meaning, in IV 145 leans decidedly to the view that the copulative force is due originally to the correlative use  $\tau\epsilon . . . \tau\epsilon$ , and it is certainly remarkable that the double  $\tau\epsilon$  and  $\tau\epsilon \kappa\iota\iota$  have held their ground better than the single  $\tau\epsilon$ , which had not developed its transitional force in Homeric Greek (Monro, §331). It would carry us too far to inquire into the nexus between demonstrative, relative, inter-

rogative, on the one hand, and indefinite on the other. It is enough to point out that there is no real difficulty in getting the indefinite out of any one of the three, and whether *τε* copulative be traced with Hartung to *τα*, a position now generally abandoned, or to *κα*, a position now generally accepted, there is no difficulty about the indefinite or generic sense.

That *ωστε* is a comparative particle there can be no doubt. Of course other relative and comparative particles are found in the same general consecutive sense. So *ος*, *οστις* with the finite verb, *οιος* with the inf. Still *ωστε* seems to possess a peculiar consecutive force, which it does not share freely with *ως*. *ως* in the sense of *ωστε* is found in Aischylos, in Sophokles, but only once in Euripides (Cycl. 647). Examples enough occur in Herodotos and Xenophon, two 'vagrom men' who are often found straying outside of Attic syntax; but elsewhere in prose we find only sporadic instances (Thuk. 7, 34 and Plat. Menon, 71 A) where it is safer to write *ωστε*. There is no example in Aristophanes, none in the Attic orators, that has not been corrected. In fine, the standard language has settled on *ωστε* as its consecutive, though, according to Seume, there was no difference felt between *ως* and *ωστε*. This survival of one especial form is sufficiently familiar, as is also the restriction of a particle to one especial use. Why is *ως* temporal used only with the indic. ? Clearly on account of its final coloring with subj. and opt. Why has *δπως* with the opt. in the sense of 'whenever' so narrow a scope? Why do *ινα* and *ως* go up and down like two buckets in different authors? When *ινα* is 'where,' *ως* is 'in order that,' as in Pindar; and so, as I have been informed, in Arrian,<sup>1</sup> who uses *ινα* as 'where,' *ως* comes again to the front as

<sup>1</sup> I append Dr. H. A. Short's statistic of the use of *ως*, *ινα* and *δπως* in Arrian, the *ως* sentences including tendency as well as purpose:

EMPLOYMENT of *ως*, *ινα* AND *δπως* BY ARRIAN IN CONSECUTIVE AND FINAL CLAUSES, INCLUDING TENDENCY AND AIM.

*ως* after Primary Tenses.

Subjunctive. Present. Anab. 7, 9, 9. Abicht edits optative, *ξχοιτε*.—Tact. 37, 3.

Optative. Present. Cyn. 12, 5 *μή*.

Optative. Aorist. Anab. 7, 27, 3 *ως μή δόξαιμι*.

Optative. Interchange of pres. and aorist. C. Alan. 23.

*ως* after Secondary Tenses.

Optative. Present. Anab. 1, 5, 3; 3, 25, 2 (after historical present); 4, 27, 7 (*μή*); 6, 5, 6 (*ως ξμπιπτοιεν*); 7, 14, 9 (*μή*); 7, 20, 9; 7, 27, 3.—Per. 17, 3.

final. Of course this limitation to *ωστε* applies only to the standard language. Incidentally Seume remarks that *ωστε* = *ἐφ' ϕ τε* is a false parallel, and that while *ea condicione ut* may give the sense fairly, the only Greek conception is *so . . . wie*, or *so . . . dass*, but surely *ἐφ' ϕ τε* (*ἐφ' ϕ*) rests on the same basis, comparative or relative, on which *οὐτῶς . . . ωστε* is built. The conditional element

Optative. Aorist. Anab. (1) cum *μή* 1, 4, 4; 1, 5, 10; 1, 8, 2; 1, 19, 8; 2, 8, 4; 2, 22, 3; 3, 23, 3; 5, 12, 4; 7, 12, 6; 7, 14, 10. (2) sine *μή* 3, 23, 9; 5, 24, 8; 7, 26, 1.—Succ. Al. 43.

Subjunctive. Present. Anab. 4, 2, 2; 4, 5, 6 (interchanging with pres. inf.); 6, 5, 6.

Subjunctive. Aorist. Anab. 4, 16, 1 *μή* (interchanging with pres. inf.).

*ως* after both Primary and Secondary Tenses.

Infinitive. Present. Anab. 1, 5, 6; 1, 6, 6; 1, 25, 9 *μή*; 2, 10, 3; 2, 1, 2 *μή*; 2, 2, 4; 2, 18, 6 *μήτε*; 2, 21, 3; 2, 21, 6; 2, 23, 3; 3, 12, 1; 3, 18, 1; 3, 18, 2; 4, 5, 6 *μή*; 4, 6, 2; 4, 16, 1; 4, 21, 2; 4, 21, 3; 4, 21, 5; 4, 21, 6; 5, 7, 5; 5, 9, 2; 5, 9, 3; 5, 15, 4; 5, 15, 5; 5, 16, 1; 5, 22, 5; 5, 23, 6; 5, 25, 3; 6, 3, 2 *μή*; 6, 11, 8 *μή*; 6, 13, 1; 6, 21, 3; 6, 24, 3; 6, 25, 6 *μή*; 6, 27, 4; 6, 28, 6; 7, 9, 2; 7, 17, 5; 7, 29, 4 *μή*; 7, 29, 4.—Ind. 2, 4; 9, 2; 13, 12; 32, 9 *μή*.—Succ. Al. 46; 46 *μή*.—C. Alan. 14, 19; 21, 28 (interchanging with the aorist); 29.—Tact. 2, 3; 5, 1; 9, 1; 12, 11.—Cyn. 5, 3; 13, 2 *μή*; 13, 3.

Infinitive. Aorist. Anab. 1, 20, 9; 1, 24, 3; 2, 2, 5; 2, 4, 3; 2, 8, 1; 2, 10, 3; 2, 13, 3 *μή*; 2, 19, 1; 2, 19, 6; 2, 20, 8 *μή*; 3, 9, 2; 3, 15, 4; 3, 18, 4; 3, 30, 4; 4, 15, 3; 5, 15, 5; 5, 16, 1 *μή*; 5, 16, 4; 5, 22, 5 *μή*; 6, 6, 4 *μή*; 6, 19, 3; 6, 20, 2; 6, 21, 3; 6, 29, 11; 7, 9, 1; 7, 12, 4 *μή*; 7, 17, 4 *μή*.—Ind. 9, 4; 20, 3; 42, 1; 43, 8.—Parth. 2.—C. Alan. 28, 29 *μή*.—Tact. 17, 4; 25, 8; 26, 4.—Cyn. 10, 2 *μή*; 21, 2; 25, 2 *μή*.

*ως* with Future Participle. Anab. 1, 3, 5; 1, 5, 7; 1, 13, 2; 1, 14, 5; 1, 19, 2; 1, 21, 11; 2, 1, 1; 2, 13, 6; 2, 19, 6; 3, 3, 2; 3, 13, 5; 3, 15, 5; 3, 25, 5; 3, 28, 8; 4, 3, 6; 4, 7, 1; 4, 7, 3; 4, 9, 7; 4, 17, 7; 4, 25, 5; 6, 8, 4; 6, 22, 1; 6, 24, 3; 7, 5, 1; 7, 18, 3.—Succ. Al. 44.

*ἴνα* is used by Arrian in a local signification (cf. *ἴναπερ*). The following cases only of *ἴνα* final were met with:

Subjunctive. Present. Anab. 5, 24, 1.

Subjunctive. Aorist. Succ. Al. 40 *μή*.

Optative. Aorist. Anab. 3, 17, 2; 5, 2, 3.—Ind. 15, 5.

Optative. Interchange of pres. opt. and aor. subjunctive. Anab. 1, 14, 7.—Succ. Al. 27 *μή*.

*ὅπως* Subjunctive. Present. Anab. 2, 14, 6; 6, 4, 3.

*ὅπως* Optative. Present. Anab. 2, 24, 3; 5, 21, 4; 6, 20, 4; 6, 21, 4; 6, 22, 3.

*ὅπως* Optative. Aorist. Anab. 1, 2, 5; 2, 8, 5; 2, 8, 10.

*ὅπως* *ἀν* Pres. Subj. Cyn. 21, 1.

*ωστε* cum pres. inf. to denote purpose. Cyn. 13, 1.

that we often find in *ωστε* and *ἐφ* φ carries with it the original finality. Rehdantz, Index, s. v. *ωστε*, puts the relation in yet another way: ' *ωστε* als Folge hinstellend was eigentlich Bedingung (*ἐφ* φ *τε*) ist.' In my judgment we have to come back to the final in the end. The conditional (restrictive) *ita . . . ut* in Latin has not only *ut non*, but also *ne* (L. G. 556, R. 5, Roby 1650, 1704). The condition is intended to bring about the result. So we often find conditional participle and conditional *ωστε* with inf. meeting, but we miss in the participle the clear intimation of purpose, which has to be gathered from the context. Hence we cannot substitute, as has been proposed, *e. g.* by Mr. Ridgeway, *ωστε μὴ οὐ* with the inf. for *ωστε μὴ οὐ* for the participle, although it must be confessed that the equivalence is close.<sup>1</sup>

*Summary.*

<i>ως</i> Pres. Inf.	.	.	.	.	.	.	59
Aor. Inf.	.	.	.	.	.	.	40
Aor. Opt.	.	.	.	.	.	.	15
Pres. Opt.	.	.	.	.	.	.	9
Pres. Subj.	.	.	.	.	.	.	5
Aor. Subj.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Interchange of pres. and aor. subj.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
<i>ἴνα</i> Aor. Opt.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3
Interchange of pres. opt. and aor. subj.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2
Pres. Subj.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Aor. Subj.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
<i>διπως</i> Pres. Opt.	.	.	.	.	.	.	5
Aor. Opt.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3
Pres. Subj.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2
<i>διπως ἀν</i> Pres. Subj.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1

<sup>1</sup> See Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society, Vol. III, Pt. I (p. 40), where, after denying that *μή* in *μὴ οὐ* with the participle is hypothetical, Mr. Ridgeway goes on to say that it is *consecutive*; the same use of *μή* or *μὴ οὐ* as with a consecutive infinitive. Inf. = part. is at any time a dangerous equation. The combinations are sometimes equivalent, the processes are different. As a rule the Greek says *αἰσχύνομαι ἐπαιτεῖν* (*ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι*, Luke 16, 3), but *οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι ἐπαιτῶν* for evident reasons. That is the natural attitude in the positive, the natural attitude in the negative. 'I am ashamed to beg' = 'Shame keeps me from begging.' 'I am not ashamed while I am begging' = 'I beg without shame.' If we put the propositions in the form of an ideal condition, the difference between inf. and participle vanishes, but that is not due to any equivalence between inf. and participle. It is due to the ideal condition, Xen. Comm. 2, 6, 39: *αἰσχυνοίμην ἀν ἀντιλέγων* (= *εἰ ἀντιλέγοιμι = ἀντιλέγειν*). See Hertlein on Xen. Kyr. 3, 2, 16, who cites also 3, 35; 8, 2, 13; Hell. 6, 5, 44; Plat. Protag. 312 A; and the same on Kyr. 5, 1, 21. But *μὴ οὐ* with inf. and with partic.

Seume next goes through the various views as to the origin of the consecutive sentence. Schmalfeld's mass of verbiage he gives textually. The only thing worth noticing about this cloud of words is, that with the inf. there is no statement of particular fact, but only of general condition. Kvičala, with his usual acumen, has picked out the final sense of the infinitive as the point to start from, but he makes the 'strong' sense of *ώστε* the leading sense, and Seume cannot accept this nor yet the final element, although he agrees with Kvičala that we must start with the simple inf. and not with *ώστε*. Viehoff, on the other hand, starts with *οὗτως* . . . *ώστε*, which is patterned after *τοιούτος* . . . *οἶος*. But Seume objects that while *τοιούτος* does take the inf. (Od. 7, 309), there is no *οὗτως* with the inf., and that there is no example of the construction of an adverb with the infinitive.

The fact is, the inf. has vitality enough of its own to express finality, adaptation, tendency, and it is found not only with adj. such as *δυνατός*, *έτοιμος*, *ικανός*, *ἐπιτήδειος* and the like, but even with colorless *εἴμι*, as in the well-known Homeric passages Il. 9, 688; 13, 312; 24, 489; Od. 22, 106. Sometimes the article is added, but the addition of the article rather changes than shows the conception of the inf., as in So. El. 1079, *τό τε μὴ βλέπειν ἔτοιμα*; Ant. 78, *τὸ δὲ | βίᾳ πολιτῶν δρᾶν* *ἔφυν ἀμήχανος*. The inf. is still dative enough for such constructions, although it is rapidly turning to an acc., the last end of the deorganized. If you add the acc. article, you at once rouse by

cannot be despatched in a foot-note, and I would only add here that Mr. Ridgeway ought not to have dismissed so cavalierly the suggestion that 'μὴ οὐ refers to a case which is immediately present.' In the original draught of my article on *μὴ οὐ* for Liddell and Scott, I used the following language, which I have not repented of: 'In these constructions (*μὴ οὐ* with inf. and partic.) the original subj. or ind., while fused with the inf. or partic., asserts, as it were, a separate life. Cf. Lat. *quin*, which is only half dependent. Hence *μὴ οὐ* generally shows the undesirable or questionable character of the negative result; and in the absence of a translatable difference from *μή*, there is a difference of tone, of personal, practical interest. Still it is necessary to admit the phraseological drift.' And on Hdt. 1, 187: *δεινὸν ἐδόκεε εἶναι μὴ οὐ λαβεῖν*, I remark that *μὴ οὐ λαβεῖν* differs from *μὴ λαβεῖν* only in intimating the personal repugnance to the negative.' Just before, *μὴ* had been used, but as Dareios warms up we have *μὴ οὐ*. I grant that the hypothetical formula has been done to death. After all, the hypothetical *μή* is only a phase of the will-*μή*, and reversion to the will-*μή* is the safest course when emotion is involved. Still we find *μὴ οὐ* with partic. as an antithesis to a condition in Philemon, fr. 83 (4, 30 Mein.): *οὐτε γὰρ ναναγός, ἀν μὴ γῆς λάβηται φερόμενος, | οὐποτ' ἀν σώσειν αὐτὸν οὐν' ἀνηρ πένης γεγάδις | μὴ οὐ τέχνην μαθὼν δύναται' ἀν ἀσφαλῶς ζῆν τὸν βίον*. And what makes it worse, the *μὴ οὐ μαθών* condition is practical.

the contrast the latent dative of the pure inf. and make the difference conscious.

ὥστε was for a long time, and still is to some extent, a favorite particle with commentators for bringing to the consciousness the less usual combinations of the inf. Oddly enough, this very particle is found where, even to our conception, it seems entirely unnecessary, and where the Greek might have dispensed with it. This is the superfluous ὥστε of which the manuals are full—just as we might speak of a superfluous 'to' after 'dare,' a superfluous 'for' with the 'to' of our inf. Of course, 'dare die' and 'dare to die,' and 'ye went out to see' and 'ye went out for to see,' do not produce the same impression, but it would be hard to formulate. In like manner we find the comparative with ἢ ὥστε and the inf.,<sup>1</sup> or with ἢ alone.

Thus far we have seen ὥστε associated with words which could dispense with it. Now, in the form οὐτως . . . ὥστε it extends its sphere, and follows the pattern of τοιοῦτος . . . οἷος. Only, in order to save his consistency as against Viehoff, Seume emphasizes the difference that in the case of τοιοῦτος . . . οἷος the inf. depends directly on the adjective, in the case of οὐτως . . . ὥστε it depends on the quality imparted to verb or adjective. Of course, like all relatives, ὥστε carries its correlative in its bosom, so that we can easily understand why ὥστε is often used alone, though the pair make famous *points d'appui* for the construction of a long period, as every reader of Isokrates knows. Of course the other demonstratives may be used as well as ὥστε.

We now pass from the inf. to the indicative form of the consecutive sentence—from the sentence of tendency to the sentence of result—from the implicit to the explicit. It is really an outgrowth from the ὥστε with inf. form, due to the desire to make the fact more prominent. In making the fact more prominent, the nexus becomes looser and, in the absence of οὐτως, ὥστε really produces the effect of *itaque*. The indicative, thus introduced into the consecutive sentence, is followed by every form of the finite verb—by optative and ἀν, by imperative, by imperative subjunctive, by optative in *oratio obliqua*. In *oratio obliqua* it is sometimes hard to tell whether the inf. is an original inf. or an original indic. According to well established principles ἀν with inf. always represents a finite

<sup>1</sup> Pindar uses ὥστε with the inf. very little; see Introd. Ess. cviii. The comp. with ἢ ἀν occurs for the first time O 13, 113, a passage vexed by conjectures. Christ has recently proposed διέμεν.

verb with *āv*, but as I have shown elsewhere, the article with the inf. and *āv* gives us an abstract form of *oratio obliqua* (Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. 1878, p. 10; cf. A. J. P. III, p. 197), and so when we find *ῶστε μὴ āv* with inf. we have a cross between the tendency form and the result form. The participle after *ῶστε* occurs after verbs of perception in the leading clause, as Dem. 10, 40: *ὅρῳ . . . οὐδὲν οὐτῶς ἀγνώμονα οὐδὲν ἄποπον τῶν οὐτῶν οὐδένα, ὕστε . . . οὐ φάσκοντα*; really no more difficult than if there had been an inf. after a verb of thinking. So after *ὅρῶν*, Dem. 3, 1; 61, 3; *γιγνώσκειν*, Xen. Kyr. 7, 5, 46; *ἐννοεῖν*, Plat. Rpb. 519 A; *φαίνεσθαι*, Isokr. 4, 64; *ἐπιδεικνύναι*, Isai. 9, 16 (cf. Isokr. 4, 21). A few instances occur outside of a verb of perception, as Andok. 4, 20; Dem. 45, 83, so that Klotz, who is followed by Seume, seems to have some justification in making the participle after *ῶστε* an attraction to the participle before *ῶστε*, according to a general law of concinnity. Still it should have been noted that the participle after *ῶστε* is rare, except where we can feel the dependence on the leading verb, so that we do not really need the law of concinnity.

When we come to the next section of Seume's dissertation, 'the rules concerning infinitive and indicative,' we come to the practical difficulty of framing a code for expressions that are naturally shifting. Our English gets between us and the Greek. Our natural *oratio obliqua* form is 'that' and the indic., not the inf., hence the *o. o.* inf. gets a false connotation. We translate the articular inf. very often by 'the fact that' = *τοῦτο ὅτι*, which begs the question. The adaptation of *ῶστε* with inf. is expressed by 'so as to,' but in the interest of easy construction 'so that' with indic. is often preferred, and 'so that' with indic. gives no greater stretch to our linguistic conscience than our translation of *o. o.* inf. In fact, before most people get to Greek their linguistic conscience is seared by Lat. *ut* with subj. All that we can do under this head is to keep, as far as possible, the first coarse renderings apart, to use verbal nouns as much as possible with *ῶστε* and the inf., and to watch the combinations in which *ῶστε* with inf. is preferred, so as to acquire a sensitiveness which the prevalent usage of our own tongue makes it hard to gain. Of the inf. in *oratio obliqua* mention has been made already. Here, whatever the original conception was, the *ῶστε* clause must have the inf., exceptions being rare, as Eur. Tro. 971; Ar. Nub. 1342; Plat. Legg. 3, 692 D.

The inf. is preferred for failure to meet the conditions antecedent. Isokr. 5, 124: *οὐδεὶς τοσοῦτον πεφρόνηκεν ὥστ' ἐπιχειρῆσαι τῆς Ἀσίας ἡμᾶς ποιῆσαι κυρίους*, but the indic. can be used, as, after all, the

failure is a fact, and the indic. in the sentence given would only be equiv. to *οὐδεὶς ἐπεχειρησεν*. 'Breathes there the man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said,' is a natural English and not an unnatural Greek form, as we can see by many examples both in prose and poetry. In negative statements, then in questions that expect a negative answer, in conditions, we must look for a prevalence of the inf.; but there is no mechanical rule. In certain phrases, such as *εἰς τοῦτο (τοσοῦτον) ἤκει* and the like, the indic., with its emphasis of fact, is prevalent, but it is not universal, and it is, of course, subject to the disturbances already indicated, *oratio obliqua*, failure of condition and the like.

As to the tenses of the inf., it is to be expected that the pres. and the aor. will occur in their usual force. The perf. is rare, as the perf. is rare in all inf. constructions outside of *oratio obliqua*. It is rare after verbs of creation, in which it is parallel with the perf. imperative, it is rare in the articular form, and it is rare after *πρίν*, which is often equivalent to *ὡστε μή*. Seume counts about thirty examples of *ὡστε* with the perf. inf., some of which, however, are virtual presents and ought not to be included. *ὡστε* with fut. inf. occurs only in *oratio obliqua*, as is shown by the neg. *οὐ*, when a neg. is used. Elsewhere we must look out for corruption. Hdt. 4, 136 we must read *στρατεύσασθαι*, and not, with Madvig, *στρατεύσεσθαι*; 8, 57 we must read, with Krüger, *μένειν*, not *μενέειν*. In Xen. Kyr. 5, 5, 30, as there is no *oratio obliqua*, Seume approves of *ποιήσειν* in assimilation to the opt. of *εἰ θεραπεύσειν*, which is borne out by Oik. 1, 13, the *ὡστε* clause containing the main thought in both instances. Compare also Isokr. 6, 84, where Bekker, Dindorf and the Zurich editors have *ὑπομείναι*. Benseler and Blass follow the Urbinas in reading *ὑπομείναιμεν*. As to the notorious I. A. 417: *ὡστε τερφθεῖς ιδών*, the critics have mumbled it much. *ὡς τι τερφθεῖς*, Hermann's emendation, gives us one difficulty instead of another, and perhaps the opt. in an imperative sense (= *ὡστε δεῖ σε τερφθῆναι*) would be easier than the unlikely sequence after *ὡς* final, or the use of the opt. as opt. with *ἄν*.

The use of the finite tenses is free, as we have said. So *ὡστε* with the fut. ind. is common enough, though it is naturally brought into active competition with the inf. of the other tenses, from which it cannot differ so much as do the other indicatives. Before the future ind. editors often punctuate so as to make *ὡστε itaque*.

As to the negatives, *οὐ* is the regular negative with the indic., *μή* with the inf. Imper. and subj. take *μή* according to the rule. *μή* occurs with the indic. Dem. 19, 218 and 54, 15, where the indic. is really

part of a conditional protasis, as Seume sees. So also in Ps. Demi. Ep. 3, p. 1478, cited by Aken. Isokr. 12, 155 has given some trouble. The passage runs: *οὐτως οἴμαι σαφῶς ἐπιδείξειν ὅστε μήτε τοῖς ἀνοίτως λακωνίζοντας ἀντειπεῖν δυνήσεσθαι τοῖς ῥηθεῖσι κτέ.* Seume thinks that we should have *ὅστε μήτε δυνήσονται* in *oratio recta*, after the analogy of the fut. indic. after relatives—e. g. Dem. 25, 92: *τοσοῦτον ἀναθέναι τίμημα χρημάτων ὅσον μὴ δυνήσεται φέρειν.* Hardly. The negative seems to be due to the leading verb *οἴμαι*, which occasionally reverts to the *μή* type. In Soph. Trach. 575, *τοῦτο . . . ὅστε* does seem to be used as *τοῦτο . . . φ*, but Sophokles often deviates into *μή* on slight excuse.<sup>1</sup>

*οὐ* with inf. is due in nearly all instances to *oratio obliqua*,<sup>2</sup> and it is not often necessary to take refuge in adhaerescent *οὐ*, on which too much stress was once laid. Examples of *oratio obliqua* *ὅστε* were given in a recent number of the Journal.<sup>3</sup> Adhaerescent *οὐ* is

<sup>1</sup> See A. J. P. I 49.

<sup>2</sup> οὐται φρενός σοι τούτῳ κηλητήριον | τῆς Ἡρακλείας, ὅστε μή τιν' εἰσιδῶν | στέρξει γυναικα κείνος ἀντὶ σού πλέον.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Dyer has demurred to the criticism (A. J. P. VI 523) of his note on Plato's *Apology* 26 D, where he follows Goodwin's Moods and Tenses 65, 3 in assuming a mixture of two constructions, and has promised to defend his position. Meantime it may be as well to present the evidence as collected by Seume and myself, while silently correcting some of Seume's blunders, as in respect to Lys. 27, 13 and Plat. *Gorg.* 458 E. It would be a waste of room to cite the examples in full, and I must content myself with the references and the indications of *oratio obliqua*. Hdt. 1, 189 (ἐπηπείλησε), 3, 105 (λέγεται). Thuk. 5, 40, 2 (φοντο), 8, 76, 6 (long ο. ο). Lys. 10, 15 (ἡγοῦμαι), 18, 6 (ἐνομίζε), 21, 18 (ἡγοῦμαι). Isokr. 12, 255 (φήσ). Isai. 3, 39 (δοκεῖ), 11, 27 (προσποεῖται). Aischin. 1, 174 (κατεπαγγέλλεται). Dem. 18, 283 (ἡγεῖ), 19, 152 (ἡγούμην), 308 (ἐδημηγόρει). Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 6 (ἔφασαν). Plat. *Apol.* 26 D (οίει). Alkib. II 143 D (δοκεῖ). Phileb. 44 C (νενομικότων), *Gorg.* 458 E (φήσ), Euthyd. 305 C (οιονται), Legg. 7, 806 A (φῶμεν), 9, 859 D (ξνομοδογοῦμεν). Adhaerescence might be assumed Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 6, where we have *οὐκ ἐθέλειν*, and in Plat. *Apol.* 26 D, where we have *οὐκ εἰδέναι*, but it is unnecessary. In Xen. Mem. 4, 8, 1 it is better to assume a shift from a verb of reflection to a verb of thinking—a very easy shift—than to resort to adhaerescence (*οὐκ ἀν πολλῷ = ὀλίγῳ ἀν*), which is spoiled by the interposition of *ἀν*, whereas it is natural in Isokr. 8, 107 (*οὐ πολλοῖς = ὀλίγοις*), Isai. 9, 17 (*οὐ πολλαῖς*). There is a passage in Lykurgus 3 which it is better to abandon than to defend. The orator has shifted from a conceived *δοκεῖ* to *δοκεῖν*, and fervor has done the rest. In Isokr. 5, 4 (*οὐδαμῶς ἀν πανσασθαι*) the neg. is caused by a preceding *νομίζειν*, and so in 11, 25 (*οὐ διαλησειν*) by a preceding *οἰεσθαι*, although the infinitive complex would suggest the negative *μή*. Could there be any more striking evidence of the potency of the *oratio obliqua* element? In fine, Madvig's rule seems to hold thus far, and the few exceptions do not weigh.

to be recognized occasionally, as in Isokr. 8, 107, *οὐ πολλοῖς* (== *δλίγοις*) *ἔτεσι*. Euripid. Phoen. 1357 is explained in this way by Seume, but it will not work, and Lys. 27, 13, which he cites, is not inf., but indic.; and in Plat. Legg. 2, 669 C *οὐδ' αὐτὸν* belongs not to *ἔστε*, but to the leading verb, which must be mentally repeated with its clause. In Plato, Theait. 157 A : *ἔστε ἐξ ἀπάντων τούτων, ὅπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐλέγομεν, οὐδὲν εἶναι ἐν αὐτῷ καθ' αὐτό*, we have an illustration of the way in which an intercalated clause switches off a construction, *οὐδέν* following *ἐλέγομεν* (cf. Plat. Symp. 183 D). Dem. 40, 22, Seume reads with Baiter and Sauppe, *ἐκτέτισται*, and so effaces the anomaly.

There remains a very small group of passages that have thus far defied the analogist. Dem. 9, 48 it is not necessary to resort to the mechanical expedient of inserting *ἴθελον* after *οὐδέν*, or of changing *εἰχον* into *ἔχειν*. The inf. after *ἔστε* is still under the domination of *ἀκούω* in the preceding clause. Dem 53, 1 : *οὐδ' αὐτὸν ὅπερ ἀπορος ἦν οὐδ' ἀφίλος ὅστ' οὐκ ἀν ἔξενερεν τὸν ἀπογράψοντα*, the imperf. *ἦν* might fairly be held to be the imperfect of impression ('I seemed to myself'), and so in the antithesis we have *ἴησαμενος*.

Eur. Phoen. 1357, already cited, Eur. Hel. 107, and Soph. El. 780, are less manageable. The adhaerescent *οὐ* fails with the first, as we have seen, and anakoluthia's artless aid will hardly help us with any of them. Anakoluthia requires length or strength, length of sentence or strength of passion. Emendation has thus far been tried with only mediocre success. But what are these two or three aberrations in comparison with the consensus of the language?

*οὐ μή* with the finite verb occurs occasionally after *ἔστε*; *ἔστε μή οὐ* with inf. more frequently. To say that it follows the laws of *μή οὐ* may seem a mockery in view of the discussion that is still kept up about this combination, but that is all for which space can be spared. Professor Schanz and his syntactical society will doubtless ere long give us an exhaustive treatise on *ἔστε*. Meantime this abstract of Seume's dissertation, with the comments, may be of service to those who desire something more than can be found in the school grammars or even in some larger works.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

### III.—SIR ORFEO.

Dating from the end of the thirteenth century, when imitation, not originality, was the rule in English writing, the Romance or Lay of Sir Orfeo is not more remarkable for its grace and beauty than for the freedom with which it handles the classic mythology. The ultimate source of the poem is evidently the story of Orpheus and Eurydice as told by Virgil and Ovid, but so different is the romance from any known version of this story that, if the English minstrel had not called his hero and heroine Orfeo and Heurodys, his indebtedness to the ancients would be hard to prove. The present discussion aims to show the direct antecedents of the Orfeo, and to throw some light on the causes that have led the story so far away from its original shape.<sup>1</sup>

In the first place, the poem professes to be a Breton lay. This claim is made not only in the opening lines—which, as almost identical with the beginning of the English Lay le Fresne, and possibly borrowed from that poem, may be left out of account<sup>2</sup>—but also very distinctly in the closing verses :

Harpours in Bretaine afterþan  
Herd hou þis mervaile bigan,  
And made herof a lay of gode likeing  
And nempned it after the king :  
þat lay Orfeo is yhote,  
Gode is þe lay, swete is þe note.  
þus com Sir Orfeo out of his care.  
God graunt ous alle wele to fare. (vv. 595 ff. Zielke.)

<sup>1</sup> I have used the excellent edition of Dr. Oscar Zielke: Sir Orfeo, ein englisches Feenmärchen aus dem Mittelalter. Breslau, 1880. Dr. Zielke was obliged to print his book with a less detailed account of the literary history of the poem than he had intended to give. His untimely death has probably robbed us of all chance of seeing his ideas in any fuller form. If he left any notes behind him, it is to be hoped they will soon be published.

<sup>2</sup> These lines are found in the Harleian MS and the Bodleian MS. The Auchinleck MS lacks them, but the omission is satisfactorily explained by the mutilated condition of that famous quarto. There is no *a priori* reason why the verses should be regarded as borrowed by the Orfeo rather than by Le Fresne. They fit the former quite as well as the latter, and there is nothing in the French original of the Lay le Fresne from which they can be derived. The English Lay le Fresne is preserved only in the Auchinleck MS, which also contains the oldest copy of Sir Orfeo.

If these lines are to be taken seriously, and not as a literary artifice, they prove that the *Orfeo* is translated from some French poem<sup>1</sup> purporting—like any one of Marie's collection—to give the substance of a Breton lay. Only through the French could a Breton lay get into English; from none but a French poem could verses like these be derived. If, however, the lines are a mere flourish on the part of the English minstrel, intended to gain respect for his piece, of course they prove nothing.<sup>2</sup> Comparison may help decide the question.

Besides the *Orfeo* there are six Middle English poems that profess to be Breton lays. These are: (1) *Lay le Fresne*, (2) *Sir Launfal*, (3) *Sir Gowther*, (4) *Emare*, (5) Chaucer's *Franklin's Tale*, and (6) the *Erl of Tolous*. Of these the *Fresne* and *Launfal* are free translations from *Marie de France*. The others are more doubtful.<sup>3</sup>

*Sir Gowther* has long been recognized as an offshoot of the story of *Robert the Devil*. The anonymous author twice declares it to be a lay of Britain:

A lai of Breyten long y soȝht  
And owt þerof a tale have broȝht,  
þat lufly is to tell. (vv. 28-30, p. 6, ed. Breul.)<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> F. Lindner (*Englische Studien*, V 166 ff.) argues vigorously against a French, and for an Italian origin for *Sir Orfeo*. Most of his reasoning seems to me to have very little in it. He certainly does not prove that it is even possible that the *Orfeo* had other than an immediate French source. His only real argument for an Italian derivation is based on the form *Orfeo*. It is doubly unnecessary to discuss Lindner's article at length, as it has been already satisfactorily answered by Einenkel (*Anglia, Anzeiger*, V 13 ff.). Einenkel refers *Sir Orfeo* to a "verlorengegangenes franz. lay, dessen inhalt dem ersten englischen Erzähler oder Abfasser der Dichtung nur noch schwach erinnerlich war" (p. 17). Zielke (p. 136) refuses to decide whether the interweaving of the classical mythology with the fairy belief "das werk unsers Dichters resp. seines französischen Gewährsmannes gewesen ist, oder bereits zuvor bestanden hat."

<sup>2</sup> The verses are found in two MSS, the Bodleian and the Auchinleck; they are wanting in the Harleian. According to Zielke's genealogy of the MSS (p. 25), anything found in the Auchinleck, and at the same time in either of the other two MSS, must belong to the poem in its oldest English state.

<sup>3</sup> Wolf, *Ueber die Lais*, p. 216, says that the Cokwold's *Daunce* is "nachweisbar auf ein bretonisches Lai gegründet." He seems to regard it as a parody on the *Lai du Corn* (p. 177). Wright's text of this piece, which calls itself not a lay, but a *boord*, may be found in Karadjan's *Frühlingsgabe*.

<sup>4</sup> I have used Breul's text (1883), but have not seen his prolegomena.

þis is wreton in parchemyn,  
A story boþe gud and fyn,  
Owt off a lai of Breytelyn. (vv. 751-3, p. 38.)

The French original of Sir Gowther is unknown, but was doubtless a free translation of some Breton lay. Normandy and Brittany were closely associated. It is chiefly through the Normans that the lays of Brittany have come down to us.<sup>1</sup> The Breton Lay of the Two Lovers, preserved in Marie's version, is founded on a Norman popular tale.<sup>2</sup> Robert the Devil, then, being a Norman story, was within easy reach of any Armorican harper. When the Gowther varies from the Robert, it often approaches Celtic tradition. Robert is devoted to the devil before his birth,<sup>3</sup> but Gowther is actually the son of a demon who has deceived the Duchess of Estryke as Uther cheated Igerne,<sup>4</sup> by putting on the semblance of her husband. The scene in the orchard and the joy of the duke when he finds himself likely to become a father, may be compared with the Lay de Tydorel.<sup>5</sup> There is nothing like them in any version of Robert. Robert repents when he finds himself dreaded and avoided by all. This is after he has murdered the nuns (or hermits). Gowther is brought to his senses rather differently—by a taunt from an old monk, who declares that so wicked a man cannot be of human origin. In like manner Tydorel, the son of a queen and a fairy knight, is set thinking by a young man who has been impressed to tell him stories at night. Tydorel never sleeps, and the young man flings at him the proverb, "Qui ne dort n'est pas d'ome" (vv. 329-30). In all three poems, Gowther,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Aubertin, *Hist. de la Langue et Litt. franþ.* I 203-4. At the beginning of the eleventh century, the Norman historian Dudon de Saint-Quentin, "pour que la gloire du duc Richard I<sup>er</sup> se répandit dans le monde, conjurait les harpeurs armoricains de venir en aide aux clercs de Normandie."—P. Paris, *Les Romans de la Table Ronde*, I 7.

<sup>2</sup> See R. Köhler's *n.* in Warnke's ed. of the Lais, pp. lxxxv-viii. G. Paris (*Rom. VIII* 34) says that the story is not yet forgotten in Normandy.

<sup>3</sup> Romans de R. le Diable (thirteenth century), ed. Trebutien, 1837, sig. A ii; Miracle de Nostre Dame de R. le Dyable, ed. Fournier, p. 36; ed. Paris and Robert, *Miracles de Nostre Dame*, No. 33, VI 27-8; Robert the Deuyll, Thoms, *Early Prose Romances*, 2d ed., I 7; Roberte the Deuyll (Eng. poem), ed. Herbert, 1798, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth, viii 19, p. 117 Schulz; Eng. prose Merlin, Ch. iv, pp. 76-7, ed. Wheatley; Gerald. Cambr., *Itin. Kamb.* I 12, *Opera*, ed. Dimock, VI 96; *Eulogium Historiarum*, ed. Haydon, II 305.

<sup>5</sup> An undoubted Armorican lay, first printed by G. Paris, *Rom. VIII* 67-72.

Tydorel, and the romance of Robert,<sup>1</sup> the son, when once his suspicions are excited, rushes into his mother's chamber with drawn sword and forces her to confess. These considerations perhaps justify us in regarding Sir Gowther as really founded on a Breton lay.<sup>2</sup>

Emare ends with the usual prayer, before which come these lines :

Thys ys on of Brytayne layes,  
That was used by olde dayes,  
Men callys playn the garye. (vv. 1030-2.)<sup>3</sup>

The story of Emare is very much like the Tale of the Man of Lawe, from which it differs chiefly in having a disagreeable beginning. Chaucer's tale comes directly from Trivet's Life of Constance,<sup>4</sup> but other versions were current in the Middle Ages,<sup>5</sup> and one of them may easily have come to the ears of a Breton harper. The title of the lay is perhaps preserved in a French form in the verse "Men callys playn the garye," which I take to mean that the lay is called "La Garie"—"the saved or preserved one"—an appropriate name.<sup>6</sup> The direct original of the English poem was doubtless a French version of this lay.

The Franklin's Tale, if we may take the franklin's word for it, is founded on one of the "layes" which "these olde, gentil Britons" made "of diverse aventures" (C. T. 11,021 ff.). No such lay, however, is extant, and it is not impossible that Chaucer simply took the story from Boccaccio,<sup>7</sup> changed the setting, and referred

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Trebutien, sig. A iiiii; Tydorel, 339 ff. In the Miracle (ed. Paris and Robert, pp. 24-5), the Eng. poem (pp. 22-3), and the Eng. prose version (Thoms, I 20), Robert does not threaten, but beseech, and there are other differences.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. F. Wolf, *Ueber die Lais*, p. 219.

<sup>3</sup> Ritson, *Anc. Eng. Metr. Romancées*, II 247; cited by De la Rue, *Recherches sur les ouvrages des bardes de la Bretagne armoricaine*, 1815, p. 9, who remarks that the original Breton and the French appear to be lost. De la Rue also cites the Franklin's Tale.

<sup>4</sup> Edited by Brock for Chaucer Society, *Originals and Analogues*.

<sup>5</sup> Merelaus the Emperor, in the Eng. *Gesta Romanorum*, Herrtage, p. 311; Matthew Paris, *Vita Offae Primi*, ed. Wats, 1684, pp. 965-8, etc. Cf. Skeat's *Introduction to the Man of Law's Tale*, and Van der Hagen, *Gesammtabenteuer*, I c-civ, 135 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Ritson quite misunderstands the passage. His explanation of it is even absurd (III 333). I know of no attempt made to interpret it since his day. Cf. with the title "Lai la Garie," the "Lai del Désiré" (Michel, *Lais inédits*, 1836, p. 1).

<sup>7</sup> Decam. x 5; Filocopo, lib. v, qu. 4.

the adventure to "Armorik, that called is Britayne." For Chaucer handled his material with conscious literary art, and is much more likely to have treated a tale in this fashion than the obscure translator who has left us *Emare*. Against this it may be urged that the Franklin's Tale has some Breton proper names, and that, in general, the plot would have been attractive to the Armorican minstrels. The story came from the East, and may have reached Chaucer through a lay of Brittany.<sup>1</sup>

The Erl of Tolous speaks for itself thus :

Yn Rome thyss gest cronyculyd ys,  
A lay of Bretayn callyd ywys  
And evyr more schall be.

(vv. 1219-21, p. 279 Lüdtke.)

Gustav Lüdtke, who has studied this story with wonderful industry and acuteness, has no misgivings in referring the English poem to a lost French *Comte de Toulouse*, and that, in turn, back to a Breton lay. These English and French versions, he thinks, followed their respective originals with fidelity.<sup>2</sup>

For all six of the poems we have examined, a Breton source may reasonably be claimed. It appears, then, that Middle English authors, however recklessly they appealed to "the book," or "the history," or "the romance," did not call their poems Breton lays unless they meant what they said. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we may infer that the author of *Sir Orfeo* was equally in earnest—that is, that the French piece from which he translated, professed to be a rendering of a Breton lay.

That such a lay once existed is shown by two well-known passages. The first is from the *Lai de l'Espine*, mistakenly ascribed by De la Rue to Guillaume le Normand<sup>3</sup> and by Roquefort to Marie de France.<sup>4</sup> The king of "Bretaigne" and his knights listen to music after hunting :

<sup>1</sup> See Landau, *Die Quellen des Decamerone*, 2d ed., 1884, pp. 94, 95, 100, 248.

<sup>2</sup> Erl of Tolous, pp. 131, 163. Lüdtke thinks the Breton lay was founded directly on Aquitanian tradition. Wolf, who derives the story differently, has no doubt that the English romance is from an Armorican lay (*Ueber die Lais*, p. 217). On the story and its connections, see Child, Eng. and Scottish Popular Ballads, II 33 ff., who calls attention to a point of similarity between the Erl and the *Lai du Corn* (p. 43, n. §).

<sup>3</sup> G. Paris, Rom. VIII 35.

<sup>4</sup> Mall, *De Aetate Rebusque Mariae Francicae*, p. 56.

Le Lais escoutent d'Aielis,  
 Que uns irois sone en sa rote;  
 Mout doucement le chante et note.  
 Apriès celi d'autre commenche,  
 Nus d'iaus ni noise ne ni tenche;  
 Le Lai lor sonne d'Orphéy. (vv. 180-5.)<sup>1</sup>

The second is from the first version of *Floire et Blanceflor*. Among the wonders shown by the magician to entertain Floire is an image of gold:

. . . grant com un vilains:  
 Une harpe tint en ses mains,  
 Et harpe le lai d'Orphéy:  
 Onques nus hom plus n'en of  
 Et le montée et l'avalée. (Ed. Du Méril, p. 231.)<sup>2</sup>

These two passages show that the *Lai d'Orphéy* was well known and popular. They show also that it was a genuine lay of Brittany, and not a French poem merely pretending to give the story of a lay which, after all, did not exist; for the French versions—genuine or counterfeit—of Breton lays were probably not sung or accompanied by the harp or *rote*.<sup>3</sup> They simply gave the plot of the real or pretended lay in rhymed couplets, with no attempt to preserve its rhythmical structure, and, if it were possible to sing them at all, could have been set only to a monotonous strain<sup>4</sup> quite different from the tune here indicated.

It is impossible not to identify this Breton lay with the original of our *Sir Orfeo*. The existence of a French intermediary cannot be directly proved<sup>5</sup>—for the three or four other places in which

<sup>1</sup> Roquefort, *Poésies de Marie de France*, I 556. I have given vv. 181-2 as they stand in the MS of the Bibl. Nat. (nouv. acq., fonds franç. 1104) according to G. Paris, Rom. VIII 36. Roquefort reads "Que uns Yrois doucement note, Mout le sonne ens sa rote."

<sup>2</sup> Bekker, vv. 861 ff., in *Philol. u. hist. Abhandl. der Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin*, 1844. The whole episode of the magician is relegated to an appendix by Du Méril as being spurious.

<sup>3</sup> G. Paris, Rom. VIII 33.

<sup>4</sup> Fétis, *Hist. générale de la Musique*, V 46-7.

<sup>5</sup> The passages cited from the *Lai de l'Espine* and *Floire* and *Bl.*, together with the *Sept Sages* ("et bien aues oi conter, Com Alpheus ala harper En infier por sa femme traire. Apolins fu si deboinaire K'il li rendi par tel conuent S'ele ne s'aloit regardant. Femme est tous iors plainne d'enuie, Regarda soi par mesproisie," vv. 27-34, p. 2 Keller), are commonly said (as by Zielke, p. 131) to prove the existence of a French poetical *Orpheus* in the twelfth century. Though I have no doubt of the conclusion, I do not think it

the story of Orpheus is mentioned in Old French literature have no necessary connection with the lay<sup>1</sup>—but must certainly be inferred as our only means of connecting the English poem with the lay of Brittany.

At this point it may reasonably be asked: Have we any other examples of Breton lays composed on classical themes? This question must be answered in the negative; for the various poems that have been at one time or another cited as such examples—Aristotle,<sup>2</sup> Pyramus and Thisbe,<sup>3</sup> Narcissus,<sup>4</sup> etc.—have nothing

follows from the premises. In the *Sept Sages* the writer seems to refer simply to the classical story, with a mischievous perversion by which the blame of the catastrophe is thrown on Eurydice. In the *Espine* the minstrel does not sing in French. In *Fl.* and *Bl.* the image does not sing at all. The tunes of the Breton lays were known all over France before the words came to be translated (cf. G. Paris, Rom. VII 1). To infer from these two places that a twelfth-century French *Lai d'Orphéy* existed, is to confuse the Breton original with a French translation.

<sup>1</sup> There are two versions of the classical story in Old French, one, a fragment, pub. by Ritter in the *Bulletin de la Soc. des Anc. Textes Franc.* 1877, pp. 99 ff.; the other, part of the *Confort d'ami* of Guillaume de Machaut, as contained in the Bern MS, printed in part by Zielke, pp. 132–3. The episode is not contained in the Paris MS from which Tarbé published the *Confort*. The Bern MS is the same (No. 218) from which Sinner (*Extraits de quelques Poésies du XII, XIII et XIV Siècle*, 1759, p. 35) cites: “Le Poète assure d'avoir très souvent vu la chanson qu'Orphée recita devant Pluton. Cela est positif.

Jai son lay maintesfois vu  
Et l'ai de chief en chief leu.”

The lay of Orpheus here mentioned is simply his song in Hades, reported in full by Ovid, and not to be confounded with anything Armorican. On Guillaume de Machaut see Wolf, pp. 141, 168. He was an industrious writer of *lyrical* lays, and probably here used the word in that sense. These lyrical poems have nothing to do with the narrative lays. A Descent of Orpheus to Hell is also found in a Geneva MS, and is perhaps identical with Guillaume's. See Wolf, *Ueber die Lais*, pp. 238–40; Du Méril, *Floire et Blanceflor*, Introd., p. clxxij, n. 1; cf. Zielke, pp. 130–33.

<sup>2</sup> Barbazon-Méon, III 96; Montaignon and Raynaud, *Recueil général des fabliaux*, V 243. The title given is *Le Lai d'Aristote*; the colophon, *Explicit li lais d'A.*, but the word *lai*, or *Breton*, does not occur in the piece. The story is of Oriental origin; see Von der Hagen, *Gesammtabenteuer*, I 21–35 (*Aristoteles und Fillis*), and the Introduction, pp. lxxv ff., and compare Zingerle in Pfeiffer's *Germania*, XVII 306–9. That the poem has nothing to do with the lays of Brittany was remarked in 1814 by De la Rue, *Recherches*, p. 26. It occurs, to be sure, among the poems collected, under the general title of “*Les lais de Breteigne*,” in the MS from which Gaston Paris published *Lais inédits* in Rom. VIII 29 ff., but this shows merely that the compiler of that collection

to do with Brittany. This, however, should not damage the credit of Sir Orfeo. The Aristotle, etc., do not profess to be anything but *contes* or *ditties*. The word *lay* does not occur in any of them. They tell neither for nor against the alleged source of the English poem. The question must be decided without their aid.

The Breton lays, now generally agreed to be of Armorican origin; attained their greatest popularity in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Most of them naturally were on Celtic subjects, and laid their scenes in Celtic countries—Great and Little Britain, Ireland and Scotland. But the Armorican minstrels did not confine themselves to Celtic themes. Their music was famous throughout France. "Le Moyen-Age," says Joly, "est un grand enfant qui, comme tous les enfants, demande sans cesse qu'on lui conte des nouvelles histoires. Ses fournisseurs habituels vont puiser à toutes les sources."<sup>1</sup> Among these purveyors were the Bretons :

Mult unt esté noble barun  
cil de Bretaigne, li Bretun.  
Jadis suleient par pruësce,  
par curteisie e par noblesce  
des aventures que oeient,  
ki a plusurs genz aveneient,

could not distinguish a true lay from a false. The MS is not earlier than the end of the thirteenth century—later by more than a hundred years than the time when Marie began her work of translation. P. Meyer (Rom. I 192) notes that Henri d'Andeli, the author of the poem, calls his work a *dittie* (v. 38), and that the title *Lais* comes from MS 837 (old 7218), whereas the other MSS of the same version have simply *Explicit Aristotes*. Henri was canon of Rouen in 1207.

<sup>3</sup> Barbazon-Méon, IV 326-54. Cf. Hist. Litt. XIX 765. The poem is a stupid working over of Ovid, M. v 10 ff. For a comparison, see Bartsch, Ovid im Mittelalter, pp. lx ff. Bartsch, who gives ample evidence of the popularity of the story in the Middle Ages, properly calls this piece a fabliau, but Paulin Paris speaks of the Lai de Pirame et Thisbé as a genuine Breton production in the same breath with Garin, Graelent, Ignraure, etc. (Les Romans de la Table Ronde, I 23). Wolf, p. 54, mentions a "Lai de la courtoise Thisbé."

<sup>4</sup> Barbazon-Méon, IV 143-75. Cf. Bartsch, Ovid im Mittelalter, pp. lvii ff. The author has handled his original (Ov. M. iii 339-510) rather freely, and has touched on popular superstition (especially vv. 454, 650, 655). "Les Bretons prirent quelquefois leurs sujets dans la Mythologie, comme le *Lai de Narcisse*," says De la Rue, Recherches, p. 28; but this poem is not a lay, even in its title, which is *De Narcisus*. Wolf conjectures that the piece, as we have it, is an adaptation of the Cantilena de Narciso mentioned by Peter Cantor, Verbum Abbreviatum, cap. 27, in the first half of the twelfth century (Ueber die Lais, p. 51). Cf. Hist. Litt. XIX 761, where the matter is confused.

<sup>1</sup> A. Joly, Benoit de Sainte-More et le Roman de Troie, I 7.

faire les lais pur remembrance,  
qu'um nes meist en ubliance. (*Lai d'Equitan*, vv. 1-8.)<sup>1</sup>

So in Sir Orfeo :

When þey (*sc.* Brytouns) myght owher heryn  
Of aventures bat þer weryn,  
þey toke her harpys wiþ game,  
Maden layes and ȝaf it name. (vv. 17-20 *Zielke*).<sup>2</sup>

We have already seen Breton jongleurs appropriating the Norman stories of Robert the Devil and the Two Lovers, as well as the Aquitanian tradition of the Earl of Toulouse. In the *Lai d'Havelok*, an Anglo-Danish local legend is in like manner made the subject of a Breton lay.<sup>3</sup> In a word, the Armoricans minstrels picked up good stories wherever they could find them,<sup>4</sup> and nothing is more likely than that, in their wanderings, they heard somebody tell the tale of Orpheus and Eurydice.

This might have happened either in England or in the South of France, where Ovid and Virgil were well known,<sup>5</sup> and where the

<sup>1</sup> Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France*, 1885, p. 41. The source of this very lay is by no means evident. R. Köhler (n. to Warnke, p. lxi) can cite only *Die driti münche von Kolmære*, V. d. Hagen, *Gesammtabenteuer*, No. 62, III 163, as in some respects parallel.

<sup>2</sup> So, almost word for word, in the English *Lay le Fresne*, vv. 15 ff., as published by Varnhagen, *Anglia*, III 415.

<sup>3</sup> See Wolf, *Ueber die Lais*, pp. 68, 217; Ten Brink, *Gesch. der. engl. Litt.*, I 227. It will not do to be too positive, however, that the *Havelok* ever passed through Breton hands. The question is difficult and has never been adequately discussed. Madden, in his elaborate introduction, pp. v-vi, dismisses it with scant notice. Wright merely remarks that the term "Breton lay" had become almost proverbial, and adds that it is not at all likely that *Havelok* ever existed in a Breton version (*Chron. de Geoffrey Gaimar*, ed. for Caxton Soc., App., p. 3). As to the English *Havelok*, it cannot be directly derived from the French, though most scholars seem to think so. Storm, for instance, remarks (*Englische Studien*, III 533): "The English lay, on the whole, corresponds to the French; only some details and names are different." On the contrary, the two poems differ in almost every particular. The English version is about three times as long as the French, and ought not to be called a lay—as even Skeat has named it—but a *gest*, as it styles itself. Storm's suggestion that the Lay "is come to the Norman poet from the Welsh" deserves examination.

<sup>4</sup> On the miscellaneous stock-in-trade of a Breton jongleur, see Paulin Paris, *Rom. de la Table Ronde*, I 15, though some of the classical traits he finds in the Arthurian romances may more probably be credited to Chrestien and his like than to the Celts. Ovid is mentioned once in Marie's *Lais*, Guigemer, 239.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Bartsch, *Ov. im Mittelalter*, pp. i, xi.

Breton harpers were also no strangers.<sup>1</sup> However it came about, there is nothing remarkable in their hearing the story. It was a subject for popular poetry—or, at least, for the lightest style of monkish verse—as early as the tenth century, when the monk Froumont wrote to the Abbot of Tegernsee :

Si . . . Dulcifer aut fabulas possem componere mendas,  
Orpheus ut cantans Eurydicens revocat,<sup>2</sup>

and it may have reached Breton ears in some cantilena similar to that De Narcisso mentioned by Peter Cantor in the twelfth century as performed by a strolling musician.<sup>3</sup>

Our Breton harper, however, probably got the story by word of mouth and in no very accurate shape; and, in making it over into a lay, he must inevitably have changed the story still further to make it square with his own beliefs and traditions and those of his auditors. In this process, such parts of the classic myth as were within his circle of ideas were retained with least alteration; such things as he could not understand, were cast aside or forgotten; many points were misunderstood and unwittingly misrepresented. In short, the Ovidian story became a Breton lay in every sense—short, romantic, Celtic. This the French translator must have rendered without much change, his aim being to tell the tale of a favorite lay, not to restore an antique. And from this French version came our English *Orfeo*, freely handled, no doubt, but with no essential variation.

The French element in the *Orfeo* is rather pervasive than striking. The English element is seen in the parliament which is to appoint a new king if *Orfeo* does not come back (vv. 214-16), and perhaps in the steward, though that personage reminds one of

<sup>1</sup> Wolf, *Ueber die Lais*, p. 10. G. Paris suggests (*Rom. XII* 362; cf. VIII 364) that the source of the lost Provençal romance from which were derived the biography of Guilhem de Cabestaing and Boccaccio's novel of *Guardastagno* (Dec. iv 9) was the Breton Lay of Guiron (*Gurun, Gorhon, Goron*). Cf. Wolf, pp. 236-8, as to this lay.

<sup>2</sup> Wolf, pp. 238-9. Froumont's poem (not seen by me) is in *Pezii Thesaur. Anecd. II* i, 184. In the *Carmina Burana* (from a MS of the thirteenth century, and mentioning events from 1175 to 1208) we read of "Narcissus floriger, Orpheusque plectiger, Faunus quoque corniger," p. 117 (cited by Bartsch, p. civ).

<sup>3</sup> Cited above, p. 183, n. 4: *Hi similes sunt cantantibus fabulas et gesta, qui videntes cantilenam de Landrico non placere auditoribus, statim incipiunt de Narcisso cantare: quod si nec placuerit, cantant de alio* (*Fauriel, Hist. de la Poësie prov.*, III 489).

the seneschal so often met with in old French poems. The Celtic element has never been discussed, and, if it can be shown to exist in any considerable degree, will serve not merely to clinch what has so far been said as to the origin and transmission of our poem, but also as independent and sufficient proof that the *Orfeo* is what it professes to be—a Breton lay. If our genesis is correct, we shall find the *Orfeo* preserving or rejecting the incidents of the classic story according as they agree or disagree with Celtic ideas and traditions.

On this principle, we should expect the harping of *Orpheus* to be made much of in *Sir Orfeo*. The respect felt by all Celtic nations for their harpers is famous. Every baron should have three things, said the Welsh laws—his harp, his cloak, and his chessboard.<sup>1</sup> In the time of Richard II the Irish kings still treated their minstrels with a consideration that shocked the English ambassador.<sup>2</sup> In this respect the *Orfeo* meets our expectation. *Orfeo* is not only the best of harpers, he is a king. The Celts were fond of putting the harp into the hands of kings and princes. Every one will think of *Tristram* and *Yseut* and *Mark*.<sup>3</sup> *Glasgerion* was a king's son and a Briton.<sup>4</sup> No less than three of the Welsh bards were royal.<sup>5</sup> Above all, the British king *Blegabres*<sup>6</sup> must not be forgotten. He knew “*de tos estrumens maistrie, et de diverse canterie ; et mult sot de lais et de note.* . . . .

Porce qu'il ert de si bon sens  
Disoient li gent, à son tens,  
Que il ert Dex des jogléors,  
Et Dex de tos les chantéors.”

(Roman de Brut., vv. 3763-5, 3773-6 ; Le Roux de Lincy, I 178-9.)

With this royal patron and god of music may be compared the crowned figure seated on a throne and playing on that eminently Celtic instrument, the *crwt*, found in a manuscript in the French National Library.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wotton and Williams, *Leges Walliae*, p. 301 ; quoted by Fétils.

<sup>2</sup> Walker, *Irish Bards*, I 180.

<sup>3</sup> Michel, *Tristan*, II 106 ; Gottfried v. Strassburg, 8058-71. (Wolf, p. 53.)

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, II 137.

<sup>5</sup> Price, *Literary Remains*, I 133, 325-6.

<sup>6</sup> This was *Blegywyrd ab Seisyllt*, 56th supreme king of Great Britain, according to E. Jones (*Welsh Bards*, 3d ed., 1808, I 1), who cites *Tyssilio's Welsh Chron.*, etc.

<sup>7</sup> The figure is playing, with a bow held in the left hand, on a three-stringed instrument. A copy is given by Bottée de Toulmon, *Mémoires de la Soc.*

The power exercised by the harp of Orpheus over the beasts of the wood is carefully preserved in the lay; for, though this trait occurs oftener in Norse than in Celtic, it cannot be claimed as the exclusive property of any people, and would doubtless have been retained by any mediaeval minstrel who had undertaken to work over the classic tale.<sup>1</sup> The Celts were no strangers to marvellous feats of minstrelsy. The Irish had a wild tale of the three sons of Uaithne, who harped at the court of Ailill one day till twelve men died of weeping;<sup>2</sup> and another of the three tunes played on a magic harp by Dagde in the hall of his foes: "He played them the Goltraighe until their women cried tears. He played them the Gentraighe until their women and youths burst into laughter. He played them the Suanraighe until the entire host fell asleep."<sup>3</sup> Nearer the Orfeo is the harping of Glasgerion, who, if not Glas Keraint, is a Briton at least.<sup>4</sup> And curiously parallel is the power with which Tyolet, the hero of a Breton lay, had been endowed by a fairy—the power of attracting wild beasts, when he wished, by whistling.<sup>5</sup>

In the lay, as in the myth, Orpheus wins back his wife by his music; and this is a trait that we should have expected a Breton to preserve. At the same time, almost every feature of the picture has been retouched. In Ovid, Orpheus frankly avows his errand, and his song is an appeal to Pluto and Proserpine to restore Eurydice. In the lay he appears as a wandering minstrel, charms

royale des Antiquaires, 2<sup>e</sup> Série, VII 154, and by Fétis, Hist. gén. de la Musique, IV 345.

<sup>1</sup> For many examples of the power of the harp see Child, II 137. Add Kalevala, Schiefner's transl., Rune 41, pp. 240 ff. Professor Child mentions Orpheus, and notes that in the Scandinavian ballad Harpans Kraft (Grundtvig, II 65-8, etc.), "the harper is a bridegroom seeking (successfully) to recover his bride, who has been carried down to the depths of the water by a merman." It is not impossible that we have here another offshoot of the classic story, developed under Scandinavian, as the Orfeo under Celtic influence. The Shetland ballad given by Child (I 217) with the title King Orfeo is apparently from the English romance.

<sup>2</sup> Tain Bo Fraich (The Cow-Spoil of Fraech), in the Book of Leinster, a MS of the twelfth century; O'Curry, Manners and Customs of the Anc. Irish, III 220; H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, Cours de Litt. celtique, I 58, Essai d'un Catalogue, pp. 217-18.

<sup>3</sup> Cath Maige Tured na Fomorach (Battle of Mag Tured against the Fomorians), in O'Curry, Manners and Customs, III 214. Cf. Arbois de Jubainville, Cours, II 191; Essai d'un Catalogue, pp. 80-1.

<sup>4</sup> See Child, II 137; cf. Price, Lit. Remains, I 151-2.

<sup>5</sup> Lay de Tyolet, vv. 42-8, published by G. Paris, Rom. VIII 67.

the court of the fairy king with his playing, and, on being promised whatever boon he may ask, demands the lady asleep under the tree yonder. In these changes a strong resemblance may be noticed to the peculiarly Celtic romance of *Tristram*. An Irish harper presents himself at the court of King *Mark*, but refuses to play till he is promised a gift. *Mark* assures him he shall have whatever he may choose; whereupon the minstrel, after a tune or two, claims the queen. *Mark* is in despair, but must keep his word or give up all title to royalty, for no liar can be king.<sup>1</sup> The parallel is very close. In both cases we have the same reluctance to keep faith, and the same warning that it is a foul thing to hear a lie from a king's mouth.

Another point in which the *Orfeo* is reasonably close to Ovid is the despair of the bard and his solitary life in the woods.<sup>2</sup> In this the lay, which is much more circumstantial than the Latin, may be compared with the romance of *Iwain* and with the story of *Merlin Silvestris*.<sup>3</sup>

The great difference between our poem and its original—the central variation which in a manner conditions all the rest—consists in the change of scene from Hades to fairyland, and the substitution of the King of Fairies for Pluto. If this change is not in the direction of Celtic tradition, nothing can establish the claim of the *Orfeo* to be a Breton production. Fortunately, the question admits of no doubt. The fairies in the English poem have nothing Teutonic about them. They are not gnomes, or trolls, or kobolds, or brownies, or nixies. They are not the mischievous diminutive creatures that abound in German popular tales. They are precisely those mysterious, reverend beings, of human size and more than mortal power and beauty, in which Celtic imagination delighted. Two or three minor points in which the fairies of the *Orfeo* resemble Celtic tradition may be mentioned before we come to the main question.

<sup>1</sup> Michel, *Tristan*, II 126; Sir *Tristrem*, ii 63-6 Scott, 165-8, II 50-1 Kölbing; *Tristrams Saga og Ísondar*, 49-50, I 61 Kölbing, pp. 105-6 Brynjúlfson; Gottfried v. Strassburg, 13,108 ff., II 99 ff. Bechstein. The details, of course, differ somewhat.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Met.* x 72 ff.

<sup>3</sup> In the Latin poetical *Vita Merlini* (formerly ascribed to Geoffrey of Monmouth), vv. 73 ff. Cf. the Welsh poem *Avallenau* (The Apple Trees), st. 15 (18). Both these are printed by A. Schulz, *Die Sagen von Merlin*, pp. 275, 75; the latter also by Stephens, *Literature of the Kymry*, 2d ed., pp. 212-22. Cf. Girald. Cambr., *Descriptio Cambriae*, ii 8, *Opera*, ed. Dimock, V 133, cited by Schulz.

In the woods Orfeo often saw hosts of fairy knights with flying banners and gleaming arms, "ac never he nist whider þai wold" (vv. 287-94). Similar apparitions were common in Little Britain in the twelfth century and earlier. "In Britannia minore visae sunt praedae nocturnae militesque ducentes eas cum silentio semper transeuntes."<sup>1</sup> The Irish fairy chiefs had always soldiers under their command and engaged in murderous combats with each other.<sup>2</sup> The knights and ladies, a hundred each, on snow-white steeds, that accompany the fairy king in Sir Orfeo, may be compared with the fourscore damsels, each with her *ami*, that Lorois (in the *Lai du Trot*<sup>3</sup>) saw, in a sort of fairy vision, riding out of the wood. Too much stress must not, however, be laid on these minor matters.

The scene in which Sir Orfeo departs farthest from its classic source is that of the carrying off of Eurydice. The queen had gone to sleep in her orchard under an ympe-tree. Her sleep was long and heavy, but her maidens dared not wake her. When it passed, she was out of her wits, and tore her hair and scratched her cheeks. She was conveyed to her chamber, where the king immediately visited her. To him she revealed that while she was under the tree a gentle knight had summoned her to come and speak with his king; that on her refusal he had called his lord, who came with a score of knights and ladies and put her on a steed by his side; that this king had then carried her to a fair palace, the magnificence of which he showed her, and had at last brought her back to the ympe-tree, where he left her with the words:

Loke, dame, to morwe þatow be  
Rijt here under þis ympetre,  
And þan þou schalt wiþ ous go  
And live wiþ ous ever mo.  
And ȝif þou makest ous ylet,  
Whar þou be, þou worst yfet,  
And totere þine limes al  
þat noþing help þe no schal;

<sup>1</sup> Ex quibus Britones frequenter excusserunt equos et animalia, et eis usi sunt, quidam sibi ad mortem, quidam indemniter (Walter Mapes, *De Nugis Curialium*, iv 13, p. 180 Wright). It does not appear that the knights seen by Orfeo had any booty with them; perhaps he did not see them on their return!

<sup>2</sup> As in the *Serglige Conculainn*, A. de Jubainville, *Cours*, II 354-5; cf. p. 361. Compare the procession of fairy knights in the ballad of *Tam Lin* (Child, No. 29, A 27, 29, 41; B 25, 27, 39; I 342 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> vv. 76 ff., Monmerqué and Michel, *Lai d'Ignaurès*, etc., p. 74. As to the fondness of fairies for white horses, cf. Child, I 339.

And þei þou best so totorn,  
ȝete þou worst wiþ ous yborn. (vv. 163-72 Zielke.)

On the morrow the king and queen took their place under the tree, surrounded by two (ten) hundred knights, who swore that they would live and die before the queen should be taken from them.

Ac ȝete amiddes hem ful riȝt  
þe quen was oway ytvist,  
Wiþ fairi forþ y nome,  
Men wist never wher sche was become. (vv. 189-92.)

The fairy marauders in this adventure seem to have been visible to the queen alone.

Apparently it is her sleeping under an ympe (or grafted) tree that gives the fairies power over Heurodys. This comes out later in the poem, when Orfeo sees in fairyland very many mortals who had been stolen away as they slept their "undertides" (vv. 339-440; cf. the reading of MS O). "Thomas of Erceldoune (in the Romance) is lying under a semely (derne, cumly) tree, when he sees the fairy queen. The derivation of that poem from Ogier le Danois shows that this must have been an apple-tree."<sup>1</sup> That Tam Lane was taken by the fairies while sleeping under an apple-tree<sup>2</sup> certainly seems to be, in like manner, a Celtic survival. In Sir Gowther the devil beguiles the duchess in her orchard. The Breton Lay de Tydorel<sup>3</sup> furnishes a curious parallel. The queen, who is disporting herself in her orchard with her maidens, falls, like Heurodys, into a heavy and unnatural sleep<sup>4</sup> under an "ente qu'ele choisi" (v. 30). On waking, she sees nothing of her attendants, but is approached by a knightly stranger, who asks her love. "If you refuse me," he threatens, "je m'en irai, vos

<sup>1</sup> Child, I 340, who adds: "Special trees are considered in Greece dangerous to lie under in summer and at noon, as exposing one to be taken by the nereids or fairies. . . . Schmidt, *Volksleben der Neugriechen*, p. 119." Is not this connected with the belief in a δαιμόνιον μεσημβρινόν (LXX Psalm. xci 6), as to which see Rochholz, *Deutscher Unsterblichkeitsglaube*, pp. 62 ff., 67 ff., and cf. Lobeck, *Aglaoph.*, pp. 1092-3.

<sup>2</sup> Child, No. 39, G 26; I 350. In D 14 Tomlin falls asleep by a fairy-hill. In the Percy MS version of Launfal (Sir Lambwell, 55-65, Hales and Furnivall; cf. Malone fragment, vv. 43 ff.) the hero goes to sleep under a tree, and on waking sees two fairy maidens approaching. In Thomas Chestre's Launfal he is sitting under a tree, not asleep (vv. 226-7). In Marie's Lai de Lanval there is neither tree nor nap (vv. 45-55).

<sup>3</sup> Pub. by G. Paris, *Rom.* VIII 67.

<sup>4</sup> Molt durement m'apesanti, v. 375.

remaindez : Sachiez ja mes joie n'avrez" (vv. 67-8). This knight is altogether supernatural, and his influence over the queen mysterious.<sup>1</sup> His home is under the waters of a neighboring lake.

I wish especially to call attention, however, to the correspondence between this scene in Sir Orfeo and a similar scene in the Irish epic tale of the Wooing of Etain (Tochmarc Etaine).

Etain was the wife of Eochaid Airem, supreme king of Ireland, and Midir, a fairy chief, was deeply in love with her. One fine day in summer Eochaid saw approaching his palace a bright-eyed, yellow-haired warrior, clad in purple and armed with a five-pointed lance and a buckler adorned with gold. The stranger gave his name as Midir, and proposed a game of chess. The king, secure in his reputation as the best chess-player in Ireland, promised Midir whatever he wished if he could win the game. Midir was successful and demanded Etain, but was, with difficulty, put off for a year, and, at the year's end, for a month. At the close of this month the king held high court at Tara. As night came on, he shut himself up in his palace with his queen. The doors were barred; the courtyard was manned by a line of vigilant guards, with strict orders to let no one pass; in the great hall of audience sat the king and queen, surrounded by the chief lords and choice warriors of the realm, each resolved to prevent the fairy chief from taking away his prize by force. The hour of midnight approached. Suddenly Eochaid was horrified to see Midir in the midst of the hall. No one had seen him enter, nor had the doors been unfastened. The unwelcome visitant advanced to the queen, whom he addressed in a song of invitation: "O, fair woman, will you come with me to my beautiful country, where all are beautiful, where none is sad or silent, where teeth are white and eyebrows black, where the hue of the foxglove is on every cheek? Beautiful are the plains of Inisfail, but they are as nothing to our great plains. Intoxicating is the beer of Inisfail, more intoxicating is the beer of the Great Country. There rivers run with wine. There old age is unknown. There love is unforbidden. O, fair woman, will you

<sup>1</sup> He abandons the queen when their amour is discovered, not for fear of an *éclaircissement*—for the witness dies at once—but in accordance with his fairy nature, which cannot bear that his union with a mortal should be known. Compare the conduct of Lanval's mistress, of Graelent's (in the *Lai de Graelent*, 503 ff.; *Roquefort, Poésies de Marie de France*, I 522), of Lion-bruno's in the Italian tale (Crane's *Ital. Pop. Tales*, p. 141).

come with me?"<sup>1</sup> Etain refused to go without her husband's consent. Midir demanded permission to put his arm around the queen's waist. To this demand the king was obliged to accede. Immediately the fairy chieftain shifted his spear to his left hand, and, encircling Etain with his right arm, rose aloft and disappeared with her through the smoke-hole in the roof. Nobody could touch him or hinder his flight. Rushing out of the palace, the warriors saw two swans floating in the air, their long white tails united by a golden yoke. The birds were too far off to be followed, and soon disappeared altogether.<sup>2</sup> According to O'Curry's synopsis of the story, Midir was visible only to the king and queen, and the former was "so overcome by some supernatural influence that he was not only powerless to oppose him, but even unable to apprise the company of what was going on."<sup>3</sup>

The resemblances of this scene to Sir Orfeo need no emphasizing. The beautiful fairy warrior Midir corresponds to the fairy king; the song describing the delights of the Great Country to the tempting sight of fairyland granted Heuropes in her vision. Both Eochaid and Orfeo surround themselves with guards on the fatal day. In both lay and story the ravisher comes suddenly and

<sup>1</sup> This song is translated (1) by O'Curry, *Manners and Customs*, II 192-3; (2) more literally, by Sullivan, *Id.*, III 191 n.; (3) by A. de Jubainville, *Cours*, II 317-18. I have followed O'Curry in inserting it here. De Jubainville is not clear on this point. Apparently he makes Midir sing the song on one of his clandestine visits to Etain. He remarks that the poem does not belong to the story. This is very probably true; but it was part of the story in 1100 (the approximate date of the *Book of the Dun Cow*) or earlier, and for our present purpose we need not go farther back than that.

<sup>2</sup> Swans, whether they properly belong to this story or not, are not unknown in Breton lays. In the *Lay de Doon*, v. 140 (Rom. VIII 62), the knight is required to ride as fast as a swan can fly. In Marie's *Lai de Milun* the hero and his love, in South Wales, send letters to and fro by a tame swan for twenty years.

<sup>3</sup> In this story I have generally followed the analysis of A. de Jubainville (*Cours*, II 312-22), which is fuller and probably more trustworthy than that of O'Curry (*Manners and Customs*, II 192-4). In some cases, however, where O'Curry is evidently following copy closely, I have preferred his version, noting, however, any essential variation from De Jubainville. The Irish text has been edited from the *Leabhar na hUidhre* by Windisch, *Irische Texte*, pp. 117-30, but this book has been beyond my reach in more senses than one. See further Ed. Müller, *Revue Celtique*, III 350 ff.; O'Grady, *Hist. of Ireland*, I 88-93. The *Leabhar na hUidhre* version is fragmentary and lacks the account of the recovery of Etain. The chess-scene is translated by O'Donovan, *Book of Rights*, *Introd.*, pp. lxii-lxii.

mysteriously; in both, the warriors, if they see the fairy prince, have no power to resist his occult influence; in both the queen is carried off, nobody knows whither. In all the particulars, then, of the loss of Eurydice, Sir Orfeo is utterly at variance with Ovid and strikingly similar to a famous Celtic tale.

Heuodys is not taken to Hades, but to fairyland. We left the lay at the same point at which we now leave the Irish story. The queen had been stolen away "with fairy." Her husband and his court were at their wit's end. Orfeo immediately abandoned his realm, leaving his steward in charge, and plunged into the woods, harp in hand. After ten years of wild life (already noticed) he recognized his wife one day among a troop of ladies in the wood. Though the recognition was mutual, neither spoke,<sup>1</sup> and Heuodys was soon hurried off by her companions, resolutely pursued by Orfeo. The ladies rode "in at a rock," which was the entrance to fairyland. Three miles the king followed them into the hillside, when he came to "a fair country, as bright as sun on summer's day, smooth and plain and all green." In the midst was a splendid castle, the walls of which shone like crystal. Within were spacious dwellings of precious stones; the worst pillar was of gold. The land was never dark, for the rich stones gave light in the night-time. In the castle, under a "pavilion," sat a king and queen whose raiment shone so brightly that Orfeo could not look upon it. A hundred knights waited on the king. Among other stolen mortals, Orfeo saw his wife, asleep under an imp-tree.<sup>2</sup> He gained her freedom,<sup>3</sup> as we have already seen, and returned with her in

<sup>1</sup> Zielke (p. 137) thinks this may be a reminiscence of the condition of not looking back imposed on Orpheus in Ov. M. x 51; Virg. Georg. iv 487-91. If there is anything more than meets the view in this passage of the romance, I should rather compare the widespread superstition that it is dangerous to speak to witches, ghosts, and fairies. "They are fairies; he that speaks to them shall die" (Merry Wives, v 5). Cf. Child, I 322, to whose citations may be added Waldron, Isle of Man, Manx Soc. ed., p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> The passage describing the stolen mortals seen by Orfeo in fairyland (vv. 385-406) is very remarkable. Zielke (p. 137) sees classic elements in it, and perhaps he is right. All sorts of fairies—Celtic and other—are prone to carry away people.

<sup>3</sup> "Bedb was a fairy potentate who, with his daughters, lived under Sidh-ar-Femhin, a hill or fairy mansion on the plain of Cashel. To this subterranean residence a famous old harper named Cliach is said to have obtained access by playing his harp near the spot until the ground opened and admitted him into the fairy realm" (O'Hanlon, Irish Folk-Lore, Gentleman's Magazine, 1865, Pt. II; Gentl. Mag. Library, ed. Gomme, IV (Eng. Tradit. Lore) 22). Orfeo

safety to his kingdom, where, concealing his identity, he tested the fidelity of the steward. The steward was faithful, and the king revealed himself. A new coronation followed, and Orfeo and Heurodys lived happily till the end of their days.

Zielke oddly remarks that a subterranean situation for fairyland is peculiar to the *Orfeo*—"diese Oertlichkeit des Feenlandes ist unserm Gedichte eigenthümlich, da wir dasselbe sonst auf eine Insel im Ocean oder in dichte Wildnisse verlegt finden" (p. 135). He is thinking evidently of the Isle of Avalon<sup>1</sup> and the Forest of Breceliant.<sup>2</sup> But we do find fairyland underground often enough, and under Celtic ground, too. Thus, not long before the time of Giraldus Cambrensis, a Welsh youngster, one Elidurus, who was playing truant and hiding "in concava fluvii cujusdam ripa," was led through subterranean passages "usque in terram pulcherimam, flaviis et pratis, silvis et planis distinctissimam" which was ruled over by a king.<sup>3</sup> This is no doubt the same realm in which Herla, a king, "antiquissimorum Britonum," passed three centuries as three days. To reach it Herla had to enter "cavernam altissimae rupis" and travel some distance,<sup>4</sup> precisely as in *Orfeo*. So in Shropshire a cavern called the Ogo Hole is still pointed out as the entrance to fairlyland,<sup>5</sup> and a cave in North Wales has a like uncanny reputation.<sup>6</sup> To these may be added the Peak Cavern in Derbyshire, at the bottom of which a swineherd, who had descended in search of a lost sow, found a land where men were reaping, though it was cold weather in the world above.<sup>7</sup> His sow was restored to him by the "praepositus" of that land. Add

recognizes his wife "by her clothes" (v. 406). The modern Irish "fairy doctress" is said by O'Hanlon (p. 13) to tell some token or peculiarity of dress by which the rescuer may distinguish his lost friend amidst the fairy troop as it sweeps past on Hallowe'en.

<sup>1</sup> See R. Köhler's n. in Warnke's ed. of Marie's *Lais*, p. lxxxiii, n.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Brun de la Montaigne, 562-7, ed. P. Meyer, p. 20, and Préface, p. xii.

<sup>3</sup> Girald. Cambr., Itin. Kambriae, i 8, Opera, ed. Dimock, VI 75, cited by Wright, St. Patrick's *Purgatory*, p. 83. Cf. Peter Roberts, Cambrian Pop. Antiquities, 1815, pp. 195-201.

<sup>4</sup> Gault. Mapes, *De Nugis Curial.* i 11, p. 16 Wright. In this case, as in the story of Elidurus, the fairies are called pygmaei.

<sup>5</sup> Welsh *ogof*, a cavern. Burne and Jackson, *Shropshire Folk-Lore*, 1883, p. 57.

<sup>6</sup> Wirt Sikes, *British Goblins*, p. 99.

<sup>7</sup> Gerv. Tilb., *Otia Imperialia*, p. 975 (iii 45, p. 24 Liebrecht, whose n., pp. 117 ff., should be compared), cited by Sir Walter Scott, *On the Fairies of Popular Superstition*.

the Wolf Pits in Suffolk, out of which ascended the famous green children, who inhabited (so one of them said) a beautiful country sacred to St. Martin.<sup>1</sup> And Eldon Hill, in the Romance of Thomas of Erceldoune, into which the queen of fairy led True Thomas,

Vndir-nethe a derne lee  
Whare it was dirke als mydnyght myrke,  
And euer þe water till his knee  
The montenans of dayes three,

before they came in sight of the fairy castle.<sup>2</sup> Similarly the young Tam Lin was caught away by the fairies "in yon green hill to dwell."<sup>3</sup>

I am aware that most of the cases so far cited may be challenged as either not pure Celtic or not quite to the point. But in carrying out our comparison between Sir Orfeo and the Wooing of Etain, we shall find an underground fairyland in virgin Celtic soil.

We left Midir flying through the air with his prize. As soon as King Eochaid came to himself, he sent out his chief Druid, Dalan, with orders not to return without Etain. After a year of fruitless toil, Dalan discovered, "through his keys of science and his ogam," that the queen was concealed in Midir's palace in the hill of Bri Leith. The king mustered an army and proceeded to dig into the hill. As the miners approached the precincts of the fairy palace, the wily Midir displayed upon the hillside fifty beautiful women all exactly like Etain in dress and person, so that Eochaid could not distinguish his wife among them till she made herself known. Then he carried her back to Tara with him in safety. He had recovered his wife from the underground fairy mansion no less effectually than Orfeo, though in a different way.

I have called Midir a fairy chief, but he deserves a more careful definition. By the year 1100 two or three lines of heathen belief and tradition had become almost inextricably tangled in the superstition and the literature of Ireland. In common with all Celtic peoples, the ancient Irish believed in a beautiful country beyond

<sup>1</sup> *Guil. Neubrig., Rer. Angl. i 27*, ed. Hearne, I 90-93; *Radulph. de Cogges-hale, Chron. Angl.*, ed. Stephenson, pp. 118-20. The accounts differ slightly. Ralph does not mention St. Martin. I owe the references to Wright, *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, p. 84. The date is some time in the reign of Henry II.

<sup>2</sup> *Sts. 30-31*, Murray, p. 10, vv. 169-73.

<sup>3</sup> *Child, No. 39, A 23*, I 342. Cf. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1832, Pt. 2, p. 223; *Gentleman's Mag. Library*, ed. Gomme, IV 52: "In Scotland the fairies dwell under the little green hills."

the sea, inhabited by gods and sometimes visited by heroes. This Elysium, related to the Avalon of Arthurian romance and the Terra Repromissionis Sanctorum of the legends, was called the Land of Promise (*Tír Tairngire*), the Land of the Living (*Tír na mBeo*), the Land of the Youthful (*Tír na nOg*), the Pleasant Plain (*Mag Mell*), etc.<sup>1</sup> The Irish also believed in certain divinities who lived underground and were called *Aes Síde*, and in other divinities, called *Tuatha Dé Danann*, who, if not originally identical with the *Aes Síde*, were in time confounded with them.<sup>2</sup> Properly the blissful land beyond the sea had nothing to do with the *Aes Síde*; but, by the beginning of the twelfth century, the Irish had long been Christians, their deities had been either euhemerized into mortals or degraded into demons and fairy chiefs, and they found it no easier to carry two sets of fairies and two fairylands in the mind without confusion, than the Greeks found it to keep their Chthonian and their Uranian gods always sharply distinguished. Hence they located the *Aes Síde* sometimes in the interior of pleasant green hills, sometimes in *Tír Tairngire*;<sup>3</sup> and *Tír Tairngire*—now fairyland—was sometimes regarded as underground, or as having a fairy-hill for its vestibule, or, perhaps, as dotted with green hills, in which its people dwelt. Thus, in the Adventures of Condla the Fair, the *fée* (Windisch's word) invites Condla to the Land of the Living and the Pleasant Plain, but adds that the inhabitants are called *Aes Síde*, "for they have their dwellings in large, pleasant green hills." Condla finally departs with her in a crystal canoe.<sup>4</sup>

We can now understand Midir better. Originally a god, one of the *Aes Síde*, he is thought of in the Wooing of Etain as a fairy in the Celtic sense—a being of human stature, wonderful beauty,

<sup>1</sup> See particularly E. Beauvois, *Rev. de l'Hist. des Régions*, VII (1883) 288 ff. Cf. Joyce, *Old Celtic Romances*, pp. 405, 410; Kuno Meyer, *Cath Finntrága*, Oxf., 1885, *Introd.*, p. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> A. de Jubainville, *Cours*, II 140 ff.; O'Curry, *MS Materials*, pp. 504-5; Joyce, pp. 401-2; Kuno Meyer, p. xi.

<sup>3</sup> Meyer, pp. xii-xiii.

<sup>4</sup> *Echtra Condla Chaim in the Leabhar na hUidhre*. Windisch, *Rev. Celtique*, V 389-90; A. de Jubainville, *Cours*, II 192-3; Joyce, *Old Celtic Romances*, pp. 106-11; Beauvois, *Revue de l'Hist. des Régions*, VII (1883) 288-90. De Jubainville regards this fairy maiden as the Celtic death-messenger. His brochure, *Le Dieu de la Mort*, Troyes, 1879, I have not seen. Beauvois (p. 290, n. 1) declares that "cette opinion n'est confirmée ni par la présente légende ni par les suivantes." Whatever she was originally, to the Irish of the eleventh and twelfth centuries she was merely, as Windisch calls her, a *fée*.

and extraordinary powers. He resides in a sídh or fairy-hill, whence he can come forth among men, visibly or invisibly, as he may prefer.<sup>1</sup> He describes his abode in a song intended originally, no doubt, as a description of the Land of the Living, but in this the twelfth century saw no contradiction. As soon as the Irish imagination entered the hill of Bri Leith, it lost itself and saw there all the wonders that former times had appropriated to the country beyond the sea. We may compare other Irish descriptions of fairyland. In the Sickness of Cuchlainn, also in the Book of the Dun Cow, the abode of the goddess Fand is called Hill of the Fairies (Dintsid), Powerful Plain of Trogaigi, and Mag Mell.<sup>2</sup> It is a country "bright and noble, in which is not spoken falsehood or guile"; it is a flowery plain; there are champions with gleaming arms and shining raiment; there are lovely women feasting. There sits King Labraid in his palace, surrounded by thousands of warriors. His hair is yellow as gold and fastened with a golden apple.<sup>3</sup> We see plainly the fusion of different elements into a more or less harmonious whole. This fusion had been fully accomplished by the year 1100—and we are here concerned with no earlier state of these stories.

Enough has probably been said to show that it is reasonable to regard the Orfeo in the light in which it puts itself—that is, as a Breton lay. Coincidences with Celtic story are too many to admit of any other conclusion. The conspicuous place which Irish literature has occupied in our investigation prompts a further question: Did the Breton Orfeo come into direct contact with Irish tradition? That is, are the striking resemblances we have noticed due (1) to the fact that the story of Midir represents views common to all Celts—the property as well of a Breton harper as of an Irish bard<sup>4</sup>—or (2) to the fact that the Breton author of our

<sup>1</sup> De Jubainville, *Revue Archéol.*, 1878, I 390-91; *Cours*, II 143-4.

<sup>2</sup> Beauvois, *Rev. de l'Hist. des Réligions*, VII 291.

<sup>3</sup> *Serglige Conculainn* in the *Leabhar na hUidhre*. Original in Windisch's *Irische Texte*, pp. 205-27. I have used the translation given by Gilbert, *Fac-similes of the National MSS of Ireland*, Pt. II (1878), Appendix IV F. Two parallels may be noted—first, the bright raiment, cf. *Sir Orfeo*, vv. 413-14; second, the means of light, cf. with *Sir Orfeo*, vv. 367-70, the words of the Irish piece: "The noble candle which is there is the brilliant precious stone." Not much emphasis can be laid on this, however. Carbuncles are a commonplace in mediaeval literature. See Bartsch, *Herzog Ernst*, pp. clxi ff.

<sup>4</sup> In favor of this might be cited the Welsh fairyland, Annwn, with its king Arawn, the description of whose castle, and wife, and courtiers, in the tale of

lay had heard from some Irishman the story of Midir or the like, and had consciously or unconsciously mixed it with the classic myth? Since either of these hypotheses accounts for the phenomena, neither can with certainty be proved. Still many features of Sir Orfeo agree more closely with Irish tradition than with anything demonstrably Breton or common Celtic, and it is easy to show that a Breton harper may have heard the Wooing of Etain much as we have it.

There is no difficulty about dates. The *Leabhar na hUidhre*, which contains the Irish story, is a MS written before 1106. If it were necessary (as it is not) to suppose any earlier date than this for the Breton *Orfeo*, there would still be no difficulty, for the contents of the *Leabhar* are of unknown antiquity, and, even in their present form, must antedate the MS considerably.

Nor need there be any hesitation as to means of transmission. Intercourse between Ireland and Wales on the one hand, and Wales and Brittany on the other, was brisk and not unfruitful in a literary way.<sup>1</sup> Several of the *Mabinogion* are thought to betray an Irish source.<sup>2</sup> When Lord Rhys held, in 1177, a great feast in South Wales, "he instituted two species of contests—one between

Pwyll, Prince of Dyved (*Mabinogion*, tr. by Lady Charlotte Guest, Pt. V, pp. 41-2), is not unlike the similar place in *Orfeo*. Gwyn ap Nudd is also called lord of Annwn and of the Tylwyth Teg, who are fairies of human size, as well as of the elves. See the tale of Kilhwch and Olwen (*Mabinogion*, IV 259, 305, and cf. Lady Guest's n., pp. 323-6). But both these *Mabinogion* are thought to be full of Irish elements (Sullivan, *Celtic Lit.*, *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed., V 321-2). Cf., as to Gwyn and his subjects, Keightley, *Fairy Mythol.*, II 196 ff., Price, *Lit. Remains*, I 146-7, 285-7; Stephens, *Lit. of the Kymry*, pp. 183 ff. It should be noted that Gwyn is said to have stolen Creiddylad (Cordelia), the daughter of Lludd Llaw Ereint (Lear), from her betrothed husband Gwythyr; but Arthur restored the maiden to her father, stipulating that the two suitors "should fight for her every first of May, from thenceforth until the day of doom" (*Mabinog.* IV 305). Here may be mentioned the romance or ballad of Burd Ellen, an outline of which Jamieson (*Illustrations of Northern Antiquities*, pp. 398-403) gives from his recollection of the shape in which it was told him in his youth by a country tailor. The story has several correspondences with *Sir Orfeo*. Warluck Merlin appears in it as advising Child Rowland.

<sup>1</sup> Note the importance of Ireland in Arthurian romance. Compare, too, the *Lai de Melion* (Monmerqué and Michel, *Lai d'Ignarès*, etc., pp. 43-67), in which the scene is partly laid in Ireland, though Marie's Bisclavret, of which Melion is a variant, is intensely Breton. The werewolf superstition is still alive in Brittany. See Baring-Gould, *Book of Werewolves*, Ch. I.

<sup>2</sup> Sullivan, *Celtic Literature*, *Encycl. Britannica*, 9th ed., V 321-2.

the bards and poets, and another between the harpers, pipers, and those who played upon the *crwth* . . . , and this feast was announced a full year before it took place, in Wales, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and many other countries.<sup>1</sup> Gruffydd ab Kynan, who had taken refuge in Ireland, brought back with him on his return divers cunning musicians, who are said to have reformed the music of Wales.<sup>2</sup> Similarly it was no uncommon thing for a Welsh prince to spend some time in Armorica. A famous example is Rhys ab Tewdwr, who, on his return from Brittany to take the crown of South Wales in 1077, "brought with him," it is said, "the system of the Round Table, which at home had become quite forgotten, and restored it as it was with regard to minstrels and bards."<sup>3</sup> Thus closely associated with both countries, Wales might well have served as an intermediary in the transmission of Irish stories to Brittany.<sup>4</sup>

But we are not driven to this expedient. The fame of the Irish harpers was not confined to their native island. Early celebrated in Great Britain,<sup>5</sup> their renown was at its height there in the twelfth century, from which dates the enthusiastic testimony of Giraldus,<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Caradoc's Chron., in the *Myvyrian Archaiology*, II 574, as quoted by Stephens, *Lit. of the Kymry*, pp. 324-5.

<sup>2</sup> Powell (*Hist. of Cambria*, ed. 1584, p. 191, not seen by me) says they "devised in a manner all the instrumental music that is now there used" (Walker, *Irish Bards*, 2d ed., I 143); but Thomas Stephens, who discusses the subject at some length (*Lit. of the Kymry*, 2d ed., pp. 56-65), is inclined to think that the chief innovation was the use of the bagpipes.

<sup>3</sup> Stephens, *Lit. of the Kymry*, p. 322, quoting *Iolo MSS*, p. 630.

<sup>4</sup> *Cornubia vero, et Armorica Britannia lingua utuntur fere persimili, Kambris tamen, propter originalem conventiam, in multis adhuc et fere cunctis intelligibili* (Girald. Cambr., *Itin. Cambriae*, i 6, Dimock, VI 177). It is often asserted now-a-days that a Welshman can make himself understood in Brittany, but this Price denies (*Literary Remains*, I 35, 108).

<sup>5</sup> An Irish king in the sixth century is said to have sent a joculator to the Welsh court for political purposes. The minstrel delighted the king and nobles by his harping and singing (D'Alton, *Social and Polit. State of People of Ireland*, *Trans. R. I. A.* XVI (1830) 225). Ethodius of Scotland, *cum, de more procerum Scotorum, fidicinem ex Hibernia in cubiculo suo pernoctantem haberet, ab eo noctu occisus fuit* (Buchanan, *Rer. Scotic. Hist.* IV 25, cited by Walker, I 98). The passage may be found in Ruddiman's ed., 1725, I 118. On the popularity of these harpers in later times, see D'Alton, pp. 162, 225, 226, 338-9; Walker, I 177.

<sup>6</sup> *Top. Hib.* iii 11, Dimock, V 153. Cited by Sir James Ware, *Antiq. of Ireland*, p. 184 (in Vol. I of his *Whole Works Concerning Ireland*, translated by Walter Harris, Dublin, 1764).

and there is evidence that, by his time, they had visited the Continent in considerable numbers. From the eighth to the fourteenth century they "appear to have wandered about the north of Europe,"<sup>1</sup> and it is even thought they got as far south as Italy. Vincentio Galilei declares without hesitation that the harp was introduced—or reintroduced—into that country from Ireland<sup>2</sup>—an opinion which has won some assent.<sup>3</sup> Of course these harpers carried their national stories with them, and nothing is more likely than that they imparted some of them to their Celtic brethren in Brittany, with whom they would naturally affiliate. To such intercourse, perhaps, more than to Welsh agency, we owe what seem to be Irish elements in the beautiful Breton Lay de Guigamor.<sup>4</sup> There is even said to have been a lay on an out-and-out Irish subject—which had, however, become cosmopolitan through

<sup>1</sup> Sullivan, *Introd. to O'Curry's Manners and Customs*, I dxix.

<sup>2</sup> As this passage has been oftener cited than seen, I may be pardoned for giving it at some length: "Fra gli strumenti adunque di corde che sono hoggi in vso in Italia, ci è primamente l'Harpa, la quale non è altro che vn' antica Cithara di molte corde; se bene di forma in alcuna cosa differente. . . . Fu portata d'Irlanda à noi questo antichissimo strumento (commemorato da Dante) doue si lauorano in excellenza & copiosamente: gli habitatori della quale isola si esercitano molti & molti secoli sono in esse, oltre all' essere impresa particolare del regno; la quale dispingano & sculpiscono negli edifizij pubblici & nelle monete loro" (*Dialogo di Vincentio Galilei Nobile Fiorentino della Musica Antica, et della Moderna*. In *Fiorenza*, MDLXXXI, p. 143). The author then describes the Irish harp. In spite of the plain meaning of Vincentio, both D'Alton (*Social and Polit. State of People of Ireland*, Royal Irish Acad. *Trans.* XVI (1830) 339), and Sullivan (*Introd. to O'Curry's Manners and Customs*, I dxix) quote him as authority for the statement that Dante says the harp was introduced into Italy from Ireland. The mistranslation appears to be due to E. Jones (*Mus. and Poet. Relicks of the Welsh Bards*, 3d ed., 1808, I 95). Of course the passage means simply that Dante has mentioned the harp (*Paradiso* xiv 118).

<sup>3</sup> Sullivan, p. dxx, who cites "Doni, Lyra barberina, etc., *Flor.*, 1763, I 20," which I have not seen.

<sup>4</sup> Published by G. Paris, *Rom.* VIII 51 ff. Compare with this lay, besides the citations of the editor, the ancient Irish tale of Loegaire (A. de Jubainville, *Cours*, II 356 ff.); the seventeenth-century Oisin in Tirnanoge (Joyce, *Old Celtic Romances*, pp. 395-9; Windisch, *Verhandlungen der 33sten. Versammlg. deutscher Philologen*, p. 26), and the story of the ancient British king Herla (Mapes, *De Nugis Curial.* i 11, pp. 14-17 Wright). The resemblance consists in the disastrous effect of eating earthly food or touching the ground on returning to this earth from fairyland. De Jubainville (II 363) compares the fate of Crimthann, but the similarity is doubtful.

the Latin version—the *Voyage of St. Brandan*.<sup>1</sup> In the *Roman de Renart*, the fox, masquerading as an Anglo-Norman jongleur, declares :

Ge fot savoir bon lai Breton  
Et de Merlin et de Noton,  
Del roi Artu et de Tristan,  
Del chevrefoil, de saint Brandan.

(i 2389-92, I 67 Martin ; 12,149-52, II 95-6 Méon.)

More than all this, we have, in an undoubted Breton lay, clear proof that Irish harpers not only played their national melodies, but that they excelled in the performance of genuine lays of Brittany. Curiously enough, the passage that shows this gives the *Lai d'Orphéy* as one of the pieces thus performed. The quotation has already been made for another purpose :

Le lais escoutent d'Aielis,  
Que uns irois sone en sa rote ;  
Mout doucement le chante et note.  
Apriès celi d'autre commenche,  
Nus d'yaus ni noise ne ni tenche ;  
Le Lai lor sone d'Orphéy. (*Lai de l'Espine*, vv. 180 ff.)

Here an Irish harper plays two lays before the King of Bretagne. M. Gaston Paris draws this inference : "La conclusion à tirer . . . semble être que les lais étaient connus en Irlande et executés parfois par des Irlandais." With the first of these propositions we need not concern ourselves ; the second is certainly borne out by the evidence. That these wandering minstrels knew the story of Etain goes without saying. It was their business to know stories and to tell them. In this way, then, the tale of Midir and Etain may have reached Breton ears.

The results of our investigation appear then to be : (1) that Sir Orfeo is translated from a French version of a Breton lay ; (2) that this lay varied from the classical story in the direction of Celtic tradition, and that these variations are in general preserved in the English poem. Further, that these variations, since they coincide in part with Irish tales, and since Irish harpers were known

<sup>1</sup> The Latin Life of St. Brandan is perhaps as old as the ninth century. See, on the whole matter, A. Graf, *La Leggenda del Paradiso Terrestre*, pp. 33-6, 90 ff. ; E. Beauvois, *L'Éden occidental*, *Revue de l'Hist. des Régions*, VII (1883) 693, n. 4. As to the alleged Breton lay, the evidence of Reynard is not altogether conclusive, though it is accepted by Wolf, p. 59, and by Schröder, *Sanct Brandan*, Introd., p. vi. Basse-Bretagne had its own adventurous voyagers, the monks of Saint-Mathieu (Beauvois, pp. 680-84).

in Brittany, may probably have been made under the influence of stories picked up by some Armorican jongleur from an Irish brother. And, finally, that it is not absurd to conjecture that in the Wooing of Etain we have the very tale which, mixed with the imperfectly understood myth of Orpheus, produced the Breton lay of which the English poem is the sole surviving version.

GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE.

#### IV.—PSEUDO-IONISM IN THE SECOND CENTURY A. D.

The following paper on the use of the Ionic dialect in the second century A. D. was prepared in 1880 in connection with some studies in Lucian. As nothing has appeared since then in connection with the three Ionic pieces discussed, I publish it as written. I have added some notes from Karsten's dissertation, *De Titulorum Ioni-corum Dial. Commentatio* (1882).

It seems probable that the Ionic, together with the other dialects, had ceased to be used for literary purposes, except in a most artificial manner, before the second century A. D. (cf. Bernhardy *Griech. Lit.* I, §§11 and 85).

Indeed an examination of the examples left to us and the references to them (cf. Lobeck's *Aglaoph.* II, pp. 997 and 998, and Lucian, *Tauch.* ed. XIV 13-15; XXI 1; XXV 16) leads us to question what degree of purity existed even in the spoken dialects. The persistence, however, of language must not be underrated, and Lucian (XXXIX 15), in speaking of a woman from Smyrna, uses the expression *καθαρῶς Ἰωνικῶν* in describing her speech.

I have made a comparison of the two Ionic pieces which are included among Lucian's writings—*De Syria Dea* and *De Astrologia*—and of Arrian's *Historia Indica*, in order to determine how far they severally agree with Herodotus in the matter of form.

For the text of Herodotus Stein's last edition (1877) has been assumed as the best provisional authority; for Arrian, Hercher's (Teub.) text and Dübner's (Didot) with v. r.; for Lucian, Reitz (1743) with v. r.; Jacobitz (1836 and Teub. 1851); Dindorf's *Tauch.* ed. (1858), the Didot edition, and also his *Commentatio de Dial. Herod.* in the Didot edition of Herodotus. This latter contains a synopsis of his emendations or corrections of the Ionism of the *De Syria Dea* and *De Astrologia*.

For these two pieces I have given below those deviations only (except for illustration of Arrian) from Herodotean form which Dindorf either incorrectly noticed or else did not notice at all.

Whatever may be thought of the implication contained in the introduction to Jacobitz's ed. (1851)—“in Parisina illa Luciani editione, recensionis nomine falso insignita, cui adornandae Gu. Dindorius prospexit”—it can scarcely be asking too much of an

editor to require him to give in his critical text not what the author ought to have written, but, as nearly as may be discovered, what he did write. This is Dübner's method in his edition of Arrian. He confines himself almost exclusively to emending such forms, etc., as are inconsistent with Arrian's own uniform usage in this same piece. He claims, however, that the imitators of Herodotus and Hippocrates did not express the full Ionism of these writers, but conceded something to their own times. Again, the editor of the Teubner text, Rudolph Hercher, taking Dübner's text as a basis, has directed his emendations chiefly to what he considered un-Arrianic; only occasionally has he inserted in his text or noticed the variations from Herodotean form.

Amongst others the following books have been frequently referred to:

1. Merzdorf's two articles: *Curtius Studien*, Vol. VIII, *De Dialecto Herodotea*, and Vol. IX, *Vocalverkürzung und Metathesis im Ionischen*.
2. Renner: *Studien I, Quaest. de Dial. Antiquioris Graec. Poesis Elegiacae et Iambicae*.
3. Erman: *Studien V, De Titulorum Ionicorum Dialecto*.
4. Veitch: *Irregular and Defective Greek Verbs*.
5. The introductions and *Uebersicht des Dialekts* to the editions both of Abicht and Stein.
6. Bredow: *Quaest. Crit. de Dial. Herod.* (Lipsiae, 1846) when not too antiquated for use.

In a work of this kind only an approximate degree of certainty can be attained. There are four more or less unknown factors in the problem: 1. What is truly Herodotean usage? 2. Did a given author intend rigidly and uniformly to imitate the dialect of Herodotus and of him only? 3. If so, how much is to be attributed to carelessness and how much to ignorance on the part of the author himself? 4. How far are the deviations or coincidences due to overwise scribes?

In spite of all this uncertainty, many points may be considered settled by investigations already made.

Merzdorf (*Studien VIII*, p. 207) is no doubt justified in believing that but little additional light can be thrown upon the text of Herodotus from the pseudo-Ionists of the second century; but we are in the dark in regard to many of the most fundamental questions concerning the Ionic dialects, and the following collation of facts, interesting in itself as showing the character and extent of

this pseudo-Ionism, may prove useful in some subsequent investigation.

No full examination of Arrian's Ionism has heretofore, as far as I know, been published, and the following notes will show that the collection of variations in the two Lucianic pieces, given in the introduction to the Didot edition of *Herod.*, is in part superficial and in part at variance with more recently discovered facts.

Of the three pieces under consideration the *Historia Indica* presents the fewest difficulties.

As it is transmitted as genuine, the investigation is not complicated by the question of authorship.

Arrian's Ionism also more closely resembles the usage of Herodotus. He has some divergencies which are not found in the Lucianic pieces, but there are fewer in proportion to the bulk, which is about twice that of the other two combined. The question remains: Did he intend a thorough imitation of Herodotus? It may be assumed provisionally that he did.

As was to be expected in so close an imitator of Xenophon, there are to be found also in this piece reminiscences of that author: e. g., §2, *τὰ δὲ . . . πρὸς ἔω*. For, apart from the un-Herodotean form of the word itself, Herodotus seems to have generally used the article in this combination; cf. II 8 and V 49, *πρὸς τὴν ἡῶ*, but II 32, *πρὸς ἡῶ*. In Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 49 is found precisely this combination *τὰ πρὸς ἔω*.

*ἀπόμαχος*, §1, is a Xenophontean word. So *ναυσίπορος*, §4, is the Xenophontean form (see below). These and other expressions occur, but there is unmistakable evidence that Arrian strove, in addition to the forms, to give his diction an Herodotean flavor. Thus 3, 10, *δοκέειν* (v. r. *δοκέει*) δ' ἔμοιγε; cf. Herod. I 131 (with ὡς) and often without ὡς; I 172; II 4, 42, etc. Again, compare 4, 7, ἔνθατερ αὐτὸς ἑωτοῦ στεινύτατος, ἐς ἔκατον σταδίους, and 10, 6, *μακροτάτη* αὐτὴ ἑωτῆς . . . ἐς ὄγδοικοντα σταδίους, with Herod. IV 85, τῇ εὐρύτατος αὐτὸς ἑωτοῦ, στάδιοι τριηκόσιοι, etc.; cf. also I 203; II 8.

Often there is evident an effort to imitate Herodotus' manner in order of words; cf., e.g., 5, 10-13 and, especially for matter, 13, with Herod. II 42-45. But the imitation of matter is more successful than that of the manner; cf. H. I. 6-9 with Herod. II 13-25. *ῦεται δὲ ἡ Ἰνδῶν γῆ τοῦ θέρεος* H. I. 6, 4 (and sqq.) with Herod. II 13, ὡς *ῦεται πᾶσα ἡ χώρη τῶν Ἐλλήνων*; also Herod. I 193; II 13, 22, 25; III 10; IV 50, 198. H. I. 6, 7 the allusions are to Herod. II 20 and 22, who combats there these reasons for the overflow of the

Nile, etc. The careful distinguishing between personal and indirect knowledge, familiar to the reader of Herodotus, becomes sometimes ludicrous, as in 15, 1, *τίγρις δὲ δορῆν μὲν ἵθειν λέγει Νέαρχος, αὐτὸν δὲ τίγριν οὐκ ἵθειν*; cf. d. d. S. §1 and §45.

For *ἀμφὶ* c. dat. (H. I. 18, 4) = *περὶ* c. gen. cf. Kuhn II, p. 424, and add to his examples Herod. V 52; VI 131.

Some other coincidences in vocabulary may be mentioned. Thus *λίμνης ἰχθυώδεος* (§41, 1) recalls *λίμνη ἰχθυώδης*, Herod. VII 109, and in §29, after telling his story in the preceding sentences much as Herod. does, he uses (14) the expression *ἄλες δὲ αὐτόματος γίνονται*: with this in particular cf. Herod. IV 53 *ἄλες τε ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ αὐτόματοι πήγανται ἀπλεγονται*. Compare the passage in general.

The *motif*, then, however superficially carried out, was a desire to revive the style, selection of matter, and treatment of Herodotus, as well as his dialect. In addition to the points cited above, the digressions (e. g., §6, etc.), after the manner of Herod., and the speeches introduced §§20, 34 and 36, bear witness to this.

The authorship of the d. d. S. and the *De Astrologia* has been much discussed, and the conclusion has been pretty general that they are not by Lucian. Before accepting this conclusion, however, it may be asked: 1. Are they necessarily by the same hand? 2. If not, does one more than the other recall Lucianic peculiarities of style, diction or treatment? 3. What reason can be assigned for the production of either one or the other?

Dindorf classes both pieces together, and in a sufficiently sweeping style declares (Com. de Dial. Herod. §22): "Exceptis paucorum quorundam vocabulorum formis, *totae* sunt ad imitationem Herodoti compositae." But it would seem that little except mere external dialectic peculiarities can be urged by way of imitation of Herodotus in the *De Astrologia*. Nor is it necessary to assume that Lucian was the author either of both, or else of neither of the two. An examination shows that they are different both in manner and in matter. It may be noted that the d. d. S. is wanting in Codex T (Vaticanus No. 87), but this Codex is "fine mutilus."

In the d. d. S. the hand of Lucian is suggested for the following reasons: 1. There is suppressed satire running through the piece. 2. The imitation of Herodotus is in many places decided enough to imply an author as familiar with Herodotus as we know Lucian to have been.

First, as to this point, we must assume that the description is written either by some superstitious author or else as a covert

satire upon persons of that character. To see Lucian in this latter rôle, cf. Alexander, Philopseudes, and Peregrinus. *E. g.*, §13, the grave statement of the wonder in comic imitation of Herod. So in §25, a plain reminiscence of Herod. III 84 and 118, it is like Lucian to find the original account outdone by changing  $\eta\nu\mu\nu$   $\gamma\nu\nu\nu\nu$  to  $\omega\nu\delta\eta\nu\gamma\nu\nu\nu$ .

It is like Lucian to relish his satire, and (§29 *ad fin.*) it is like him to find: "For my part, I think the fear of falling also contributes a good deal to their wakefulness." Again, §30 *ad fin.* seems like Lucianic mockery; cf. too §32. §37 reminds us of the lies which he tells the credulous mob about the death of Peregrinus. In §40 note the half-casual addition of  $\epsilon\nu\nu$   $\gamma\nu\nu\nu\nu$ . In §45  $\kappa\nu\epsilon\epsilon\nu\tau\nu\pi\nu\nu$  might be either Lucian's fun or the credulity of a dupe, but in the next section the solemn explanation, by conjecture, of the jugglery would be admirable by way of imitation of Herod. §§53 and 54 seem to contain hits at Jewish observances (cf. *De Morte Peregrini*).

Finally, just as in §1 he said: "γράφω δὲ Ἀσσύριος εῶν," so at the end, to justify more fully his claim to knowledge, "αὐτοψίη," he claims to have been subjected when a boy to the ceremony he describes.

The *De Astrologia*, on the other hand, does not bear the marks of an author who, however great his faults, rarely descended to the level of uniform dullness presented by this piece without the suspicion of satire to enliven it. At most we should have to assume that it was a late production of Lucian's, written possibly during his stay in Egypt, as a lecture, to show his familiarity with mythology. When his vitality had been sapped he may possibly have attempted a serious scientific explanation of current superstitions. In the savage (?) use of the word  $\gamma\nu\nu\nu\nu$  (§10) one might fancy he saw the traces of Lucian's hand, or in a fancied satiric tinge at the end of §24. But the whole is very flat, and is most probably the work of some third-class writer.

Some things, however, would seem to indicate that both are productions of the same author. Compare *De Astr.* §7,  $\nu\nu\mu\nu$ , and §14,  $\nu\nu\mu\nu\nu$ , with *d. d. S.* §10,  $\nu\nu\mu\nu$ . Also the use of  $\epsilon\nu\nu\nu\nu$  for  $\epsilon\nu\nu$ , which occurs in both. But this latter epic peculiarity may have belonged to a stock-in-trade of second-century Ionisms, and hence would not prove a unity of authorship. Aretaeus, an imitator of Hippocrates, used it; cf. Mattaire's *Commentariolus*, p. 515: "Infinitivus modus transformat - $\epsilon\nu$  in - $\epsilon\nu\nu\nu$ ,

-ειναι in -έμεναι, -ῆναι in ημεναι," *e. g.*, B. I. Morb. Acutorum, c. 7; Morb. Diturn. I, c. 5, etc., in all of which we find ημεναι.

Secondly, imitation of Herodotus. Lucian's own expressions of contempt (*vid. supra*) for those who affect Ionic, do not militate against the probability of his having tried to beat them at their own game, while at the same time he made good his opportunity for ridiculing the piety of the old historian as well as the superstitions of his own time. He has himself (Luc. XXI 1) apprised us of his admiration for Herodotus as a writer, and he certainly would have been as capable of imitating him as would any other writer of the second century A. D.

In the following passages and turns of thought an imitation is apparent. In the first place, the dialectic and other obvious resemblances may be passed over—*e. g.*, πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων τῶν ημεῖς ιδμεν, or Κομβάθου μέν μοι (πέρι) τοσάδε εἰρήσθω ορ δοκέειν δέ μοι (cf. Arr. H. I. and *vid. Dindorf ad loc.*).

In d. d. S. §25, ὁ Κομβάθε κ. τ. λ., reminds us of the address of Darius to the mutilated Zopyrus, Herod. III 155; and further on in the same section there appears to be exaggerated allusion to the honors heaped upon Zopyrus, and by the words ἐσθῆτες Ἀσσύριαι we are reminded of the ἐσθῆτα Μηδικήν (Herod. III 84); and again, for the permission to go to the king without announcement, cf. Herod. III 84 and 118. And finally, though this is less evident, by the last clause in §25 we are reminded of Herod. III 160: "τούτῳ γὰρ οὐδεὶς Περσέων ἡξιώσει καὶ ἐωντὸν συμβαλεῖν." Again, in §27, πρότερον δέ μοι θυμός εἰπεν suggests Herod. I 1, ἡν θυμός (ἀνέεσθει), or VII 116, θυμός σφι ἐγένετο θησασθαι τὸν πόλεμον. In §30, ησκηται used of buildings has an Herodotean flavor; cf. Herod. II 130, 169; III 57.

Below follows a comparison of the Ionic forms and the deviations from the Ionism of Herodotus as exhibited in the three pieces under discussion.

§1. *Dual.* It is commonly accepted that Herodotus did not make use of the dual number either in declension or in conjugation (*vid. Stein and Abicht*), and Kühner, Ausf. Gram. I, §98, says: "Im ganzen Herodot findet sich der Dual nur an zwei Stellen durch die codd. gesichert" (*i. e.*, I 11 u. 91). In his second volume, however, §349, 3, Kühner tells us: . . . "Prosaiker, wie Herodot, die älteren Attiker, auch Xenophon u. A. gebrauchen denselben (d. i. den Dual) häufig." This latter statement is carelessness, but Dübner also seems to forget the facts when deciding

upon the use of the *fem.* dual of the article: *Arr. Ind. XVI 9*, ἀμφοῖν ταῦν χεροῖν, v. l. ἀ. τοῖν χ., "quod," he says, "non recepi, Ionicorum scriptorum exempla quia non in promptu<sup>1</sup> erant." This does not have much point if he is referring to epic usage, while if the so-called "New-Ionic" writers are intended, we are told that it is entirely foreign to the usage at least of Herodotus.

In the *d. d. S.* §30, we find ὀργυιέων δυοῖν. In the two Herodotean passages above cited, Stein writes δυῶν.<sup>2</sup> In the *H. I.* occur a number of instances of the dual, so that we must assume that Arrian, if he was imitating Herodotus in form, neglected or was ignorant of this peculiarity. In §VII 1, δυοῖν: this particular form might be justified from the two passages cited, or from inscriptions, but there occur others both in declension and conjugation—viz.: §XVII 6, . . . δοκίμω ἄνδρε, ἀνεγραψάτην; in §XIV 5 and 6, several instances in a description of an elephant playing a pair of (or rather three) cymbals. The situation may be sufficient to account for a deliberate deviation.

Hippocrates does not seem to have used the dual, and although I have found one instance in his imitator of this period—*Aretaeus* (Βιβ' ἐγκύψαι τῷ πόδε)—it is not to be found in a number of other passages where pairs (hands, feet, etc.) are mentioned. There does not seem to be secure evidence that either the "New-Ionic" writers used the dual or the Ionists of the second century A. D.

*Augment.* Dindorf (*Commentatio de Dial. Herod. ad d. d. S.* §:8) conjectures for ἀμείβετο, ἡμείβετο (on the analogy of ἡρξατο, which he had just above corrected to the true *Hdt.* form—*vid.* Stein) or ἀμείβεται; in his *Tauchnitz* edition, however, he writes ἀμείβετο ("never augmented," Stein), and in this same edition, *d. d. S.* §22, he augments αὐλίξετο "now," as Veitch says significantly (*vid.* Veitch, *Greek-Verbs* s. v.).

Abicht lays down the rule: "In all verbs beginning with the diphthongs *ai*, *av*, *eu*, *oi*, the augment is omitted." Stein, however, limits this, but says that no verbs beginning with *eu* (except εῦδω), or with *oi*, are augmented. He mentions also a number of others beginning with the other diphthongs which are not augmented.

But in Arrian we find φκισμένοι, φκει (*Dübner*, 18, 10 φκεε) in 1, 2, 5; 5, 13; 10, 4; 18, 10; 22, 10, etc.

<sup>1</sup> A good example in *Attic* is *Andocides I 144*, ταῖν χεροῖν ταῖν ἐμαντοῦ, where the *fem.* article occurs twice, making the reading more secure.

<sup>2</sup> *Genitivum* δυῶν bis exhibet titulus Chius quinto saeculo exaratus. (Karsten, §12.)

Dindorf (Comment. de Dial. Herod. ad d. d. S. §24) says that the Codices give here *εἰργασμένον*, as *εἰργάσαο*, §25 (for term. cf. Merz. Studien VIII, p. 187); so too De Astrologia, §23, “*ἐργάξοντο*: Probabilius *εἰργάξοντο*.” Stein says, “*ἐργάξομαι* stets ohne Augment.” With this compare Arr. H. I. 28 2: *εἴων* Ep. and Att. for *ἔων*. So d. d. S. §31, epic form *εἴαται*; cf. Herod. II 86 *κατέαται*, and IX 90, *κατέαρο*. Dindorf, moreover, d. d. S. §25 (Tauch. ed.) accepts *ἡτε* for *ἄτε*; also, §26, he writes *διγρέοντο* for *διατέοντο*. Merzdorf and Stein omit augment and give contract form *διατώντο*; cf. (Studien VIII, p. 194) Catalogue of Contract Verbs, and, e. g., Herod. I 120, 123; III 65; IV 95, 114, 121, etc.

In this connection cf. form *ἔοικός* in Arr. H. I. 6, 6. Hercher, in accordance with his practice of emending only in accordance with Arrian's own usage, says: “In sequentibus pro *ἔοικός* scripsi *εἰκός*.” The commonly approved Herodotean forms are: *οίκα*, *οἰκός*, etc. Veitch says this is true “in the case of the participle, but the indic. *ἔοικε* occurs often without v. r.” Here perhaps it is an epic reminiscence.

In Arr. 13, 10 occurs the form *ἔαλωκότας*. Veitch discusses this form at length, q. v. Merzdorf (Studien, VIII 142) regards *ἡλωκ-* Herodotean.

*ἐκεῖνος and ἐθελω.* In d. d. S. §60, Dindorf (De Dial. Herod.) says: “Scribendum *ἐκεῖνοι ex codicibus.*” Erman (De Dial. Tit. Ion. Studien V., p. 286-7) shows from inscriptions that Dindorf and Bredow are wrong in denying the shorter forms for these words.

*Declension.* Nouns of the third decl. ending in *ις* and *ις*. In the acc. pl. Stein allows both the contracted and uncontracted forms,<sup>1</sup> and so Kühner (cf. I, p. 348, “Die ep. Akkusativform auf *ιας* st. *ις* kommt sehr häufig vor, so *πόλιας* an sehr vielen Stellen ohne Variante, ebenso . . . *πανηγύριας*,” 6, 3). Arrian, however, seems to have used the uncontracted forms throughout; cf. Hist. Ind. 7, 2, 3; 11, 11; 12, 5; 32, 11 *πόλιας*, and 6, 8, etc. *ἰχθύας*; 15, 3 *τίγριας* (Cod. A *τίγρης*), etc.

So also in the two Lucianic pieces Jacobitz has the uncontracted forms throughout. Dindorf, however (Tauch. ed., 1858), without adducing MS authority writes *πανηγύρις*, d. d. S. §§1 and 2, and *πόλις*, De Astr. §23 (R. and J. *πόλιας*), but De Astr. §7 and d. d. S. §14 *ἰχθύας*, and De Astr. §22 *πόλιας*. In nom. pl. Stein gives *πόλιες* (*πόλιις*?) and Kühner says: “Der Nom. Pl. findet sich nur ganz

<sup>1</sup>Accusativi pluralis exempla in quinti saeculi titulis habes duo, alterum solutam praebens formam *πόλιας*, alterum contractam *πρήσις* (Karsten, §11, 3).

vereinzelt ohne Variante." D., however, writes, d. d. S. §10, *πανηγύρις*; §12, *δῆμος*; and §14, *πίστις*. In Arr. H. I. 8, 5, Dübner, *πόλις* (Cod. *πόλης*).

*βοῦς* and *χοῦς*. The epic acc. pl. *βόας* occurs in d. d. S. (D. and J.) §54; De Astr. §22 (probably here an Homeric reminiscence, "Ἡλίου τὰς *βόας*"); and Arr. H. I. 7, 7. Herodotus always has acc. pl. *βοῦς* (cf. Kühner, I, p. 352), but nom. pl. *βόες*. Merzdorf (Studien VIII, p. 215) discusses<sup>1</sup> this form and also *χοῦς*, \**χοφός*, *χοῦν*. In Arr. H. I. 13, 3 and 5 this latter word occurs once in the Herodotean form *χοῦν* and once *χόον*. For the sake of uniformity Dübner changes one (c. 5) and writes both *χόον*. But Kühner, I, p. 393: "In der Bedeutung von aufgeworfener Erde (which is the meaning l. c.) geht δ *χοῦς* nur nach *βοῦς*." So Stein, *χοῦν*, Hdt. VII 23.

Some other points may be noticed in the third declension. Thus *μάντεων*, Astr. §23, for *μαντίων* (e. g., Hdt. III 124). Arrian, H. Ind. §18, 4; 18, 10, *Ἀμφιπόλεως*<sup>2</sup> and -λει<sup>3</sup> occur for the Hdtean. forms -ολιος and -λι, and 21, 3 *ἀμπάτεσι* for *ἀμπάτισι*. Elsewhere, Ind. 29, 9; 30, 8 and 37, 5, Arrian has the form ἀνά πάτις.

Passing to adj. in -γεως, we find that Dindorf allows, d. d. S. §7, the word *ξανθόγεως*; but adjectives formed from γῆ take, in Hdt., the suffix -γαιος (*vid. Stein*), although the prefix is γεω- (e. g., *γεωπέδων* and *vid. Merz. St. IX*, p. 236). Hence this should be *ξανθόγαιος*, if formed as in Herodotus. Arrian has the correct form—e. g., 22, 2 *μεσογαίην*.

In the declension of the word *Μίνως* we find, De Astrol. §20, the acc. sing. *Μίνω*. This is the epic form (though also the Attic). The Attic decl. runs *Μίνως*, gen. *Μίνωος* (once *Μίνω*), acc. *Μίνω*. In Hdt. it is declined, gen. *Μίνω* (*bis*), acc. *Μίνων*; cf. Hdt. 170 and 171. Once, indeed, the gen. *Μίνωος* does occur, but from this would have resulted, according to the ordinary rules of Ionic resolution, *Μίνωα* in the acc., just as the acc. *Ηρωα* is found in Hdt. alongside of the form *Ηρων* (*Μίνωα* and *Μίνω* are also found in v. ll.)

<sup>1</sup> But see K. Z. Vol. XXV, pp. 17 and 19.

<sup>2</sup> *πόλεως* . . . in titulo Chio bis legitur (Karsten, §18, 4).

<sup>3</sup> Reitz, ad d. d. S. §60: "πόλει. Qui delicias Ionicas amat, πόλι scriberet. . . . Sed quia πόλει perpetuo in hac Dial. ut c. 1, 10, 13, 21 ac 22, etc., nihil mutavi, etsi scribarum vitium puto." Dindorf changes to *πόλι* (Roehl, I. G. No. 497, 31, *δινάμει*; cf. Renner, Stud. V 305). Karsten, §11, gives *χώρι* from a fifth-century inscription; cf. also §17.

So in d. d. S. §22 D. allows the Ep. gen. *γούνων* for Herod. *γοννάρων*, although just below he corrects the Ep. gen. *ἀπρίκτον*.

*Contracts.* In d. d. S. §55, Dindorf would write *ἀείπας* for *ἄπας*, with which compare §52, *ἀείπαρτες*. There is much diversity of opinion on this point. Stein always writes the uncontracted forms —e. g., I 87; I 90; VIII 56, etc. Veitch,<sup>1</sup> however, says that Hdt. uses the contract form as well as the other, and that both forms occur in Hippocrates. Arrian (H. I.) has constantly the contract forms—e. g., 25, 7; 27, 2, 3, 4, 6; 29, 1, 7. Finally, Merzdorf (Stud. V, pp. 186-7) says: “Bredovius, Dindorfius, Steinius pleniorē formam solam Herodoteam esse statuerunt, quod, *quamquam in tit. Ephes. C. I 2953*, a Kirchhoffio . . . medio saeclo quinto attributo, *ἐπάπας ἐπάρη* reperitur, itemque in mitiore Hippocratis Ionismo formae contractae praevalent: . . . (Renner, St. I 1, 189), jure fecerunt, cum analogia vocabulorum *ἀείδω* *ἀεισμα* deciens extantium et verborum *ἀεικεῖν* *ἀεικές* etiam *ἀείρω* solutum poscat.” The verb (*ἐπ*)*ἀείδω* occurs too, Arr. Ind. 10, 1, in the contracted form *ἐπάδονται*. (This is also left uncontracted by Stein.)

Compounds with *θερός* are usually (for exceptions *vid. Stein*) left uncontracted in Herodotus (cf. Merzdorf, Studien VIII, p. 213); in Arr. Ind. 12, 1 the forms *δημιουργικόν* and *λειτουργοί*; *προσπτον*, §20, 3, therefore do not conform. So also §9, 5, *τεσσαρακοντούτες* (wrong also in the numeral itself. Ionic *τεσσεράκοντα*), and finally §9, 7, *τριακοντούτες*. Arrian has the correct form, *ηλιος*, which Dindorf notices as Herodotean in his *Commentatio*, although he retains *ηέλιος* “ex codicibus” in his *Tauch. ed. of Lucian*.

Arrian, H. I. 19, 5, has the form *δώδεκα*. Herod. wrote *δυάδεκα* (cf. Stein); for this we have independent evidence from a Thasian inscription (*vid. Studien V, p. 306, Erman*) containing this word.

In reference to the declension of the word *θορέης* a few points may be noticed. d. d. S. §28, *θορέην* the acc. is the correct Ionic form, but the tetrasyllabic genitive *θορέω* is not Herodotean. Dindorf, to be sure, so declines the word and (Comm. de Dial. Her. §9) says: “Si poetae literam ejicere quam synizesin duabus ultimis

<sup>1</sup> Supporting Veitch is Brugmann, K. Z. XXVII, pp. 197-8: “Neben der präsensform *ἀείρω* (Homer, Herodot, tragiker), . . . hat man die form *αιρω* bei, . . . Herodot (*ἀπαιρωσι*, VIII 57, 60; *ἐπαιρεις*, VII 10).” Speaking of the analogy of *ἀείδω*, *ἀεικής*, etc., he says: “Unsere darlegung zeigt das dieser grund zu ausmerzung von *αιρω* bei Herodot hinfällig ist.”

syllabis adhibere maluerunt, rationem secuti sunt idoneam. Quae quum nulla sit in oratione prosa, ego plenam formam εεω ubique vel ex codicibus vel ex conjectura restitui," etc. But Merzdorf (St. VIII, p. 172), in treating of the combination εεω, brings up various examples to show that this special triple combination<sup>1</sup> was not liked by the Ionians, and instances this word βορέω, claiming that the trisyllabic form only has MS authority.

Dübner, Arr. Ind. 2, 1, writes (contrary to Codex A, which has βορέον) βορέω. Arrian 6, 9 has also the form βορειότερον for the Herodotean βορηιότερον.

Another group of contractions may be noticed in connection with the form which Dindorf (De Astr. §17) writes—*i. e.*, ἐπενώσαντο for ἐπενοήσαντο. According to Merzdorf, St. VIII, p. 221, this is a false analogy from the true contractions in the aor. and perf. of βοάω. Merzdorf claims that there was an essential difference between the η sprung from ε, as in νοέω, and that from α, as in βοάω. Stein, however, admits these contracts from νοέω when they occur alongside of the uncontracted forms, but derives them from a different stem. Merzdorf thinks this incredible. Still further astray, he continues, is Dindorf in making the contraction within the stem—*e. g.*, βωθήσαι for βοηθησαι, as if parallel to βῶσαι. Stein agrees on this point: "ἐβάθεον ἐβάθησαν u. ä. von βοηθέω standen bisher an einigen Stellen, haben sich aber als gefälscht erwiesen." In this connection is to be noted, Arr. Ind. 10, 6, the un-Herodotean form ὁγδοίκοντα for ὁγδώκοντα.

*Contractions in flexional endings*, especially in verbs ending in αω, εω, and οω. As little or nothing is certainly established (*vid.* Merzdorf's detailed discussions in St. VIII), I will notice only a few forms in the pieces under our consideration. In De Astr. §19, if Herodotean forms are to be inserted at all, we must read for ἀπαιωρούμενος, either ἀπαιωρέμενος (cf. Hdt. IV 103; VII 61, 92), or, if the question be so decided, ἀπαιωρέύμενος.

In Arr. H. I. 20, 3, Dübner has emended ἐπινοούμενα to ἐπινοεύμενα, while ἀπομαχούμενοι, §24, 2 (fut.) (per emend. Dübneri), would be

<sup>1</sup> To show the need of caution in accepting any sweeping statements about the passion of the Ionians for vowel-sounds indefinitely succeeding one another, it is worth while to note the results from the inscriptions; *e. g.*, Erman St. V, p. 290 (De Tit. Ionic. Dial.), in discussing proper names made up of the suffix from κλέος, says: "Diu . . . ante Herodotum in duabus Ionum sedibus inter se quam maxime distantibus, Miletii et in coloniis Chalcidensibus, contractam reperimus formam (*i. e.*, -κλής)." *Vid.* also p. 291 *ad fin.*

*ἀπομαχεσόμενοι* (Veitch and Abicht), or *ἀπομαχησόμενοι* (Stein), if conformed to Herodotus.

Of the transfer of verbs in *-ω* to *-εω* not much need be said. Dindorf in his *Commentatio* corrects the numerous un-Herodotean forms of the verb *όράω* found in his edition of 1858 in accordance with the laws given by Merzdorf (cf. Stein VIII, p. 207, etc.). The form *μεταπηδέων* (Ion. for *μεταπηδάων*), d. d. S. §36, shows that the author of the d. d. S. was not ignorant of this dialectic law. Of the usage of Arrian, Dübner says in the preface to the Didot edition: "Verborum in *έω* formae Ionicae frequentes sunt in codicibus, atque eas haud cunctanter posui ubique: sed verborum in *άω* et in *όω* nullae usquam praeter vulgares formas apparent, exceptis tribus, *όρέομεν*, *κομόωντες* (*bis*) et *χρείμενοι*: in his igitur substitui, quum vel in nativis Ionibus horum verborum conjugatio nondum prorsus sit ad liquidum perducta."

Of the following verbs in the *Hist. Ind.*—*i. e.*, *πλανώμενοι* 7, 2; *τρυγώσιν* 11, 10; *θηρώσι* 13, 1; *έξεπήδων* 28, 4; *άναφυσόμενον* 30, 2; *ἐπηρώτων* (wrongly for *-ειρωτων*, cf. Veitch) 33, 6; *βοῶντες* 33, 7; and *άνηρώτα* (wrongly for *ἀνειρώτα*) 35, 7—all except *τρυγώσι* (wh. Stein, Herod. IV 199, contracts) and *έξηπήδων* are included by Merzdorf (*vid. St. VIII*) in his lists of verbs which are either usually or always contracted in Herodotus as in Attic.

The remaining forms—*i. e.*, those from *όράω*—contracted by Arrian—*e. g.*, *όρώμενα* 30, 6; and *κατορώσιν* (3 p., pl.) (emended by Dübner from *καθορ-*) 32, 6 and 37, 4—are shown by Merzdorf to vary greatly in the MSS.

*Diaeresis.* In *De Astr.* §1 (Dind. Tauch. ed.) *μαντείης* and *ἀληθείης* occur. The latter is correctly retained (ex Cod. 90) as coming from the proparoxytone *ἀλήθεια*, while the form *μαντηίης* from the paroxytone *μαντεία* should have been allowed to stand (cf. Abicht: *Uebersicht des Dial. Herod.* §2). In *De Astr.* §2, from the two readings *ἄδριη* ("codex unus") and *ἄδρειη* ("alii") he selects the former in his Tauch. edition, possibly because this is an epic word. In his *Commentatio*, however, he had said: "Quod *ἄδρηη* scribendum." Stein and Abicht, however (Hdt. VI 69), edit *ἄδρείη*, on the analogy of *ἀλήθεια*, *ἀληθείη*.

With this cf. Arr. H. I. §17, 4, *ἀνδρίην* (v. r. *ἀνδρίαν*) for Herodotean form *ἀνδρηίην*, and §40, 1, *λησταί* for *λησταῖ*. He writes *ἀρήιον* correctly for *ἄρειον*, for this is made by Herod. himself (cf. Herod. VIII 52, Abicht) an exception to the rule for proparoxytones.

Dindorf prefers the reading (Cod. 90) *De Astr.* §§6 and 10 (Tauch. ed.) *ξώια*, but Herodotus retained the contraction.

The Ionic form of *θῶμα* Stein writes *θῶμα* ("ein abgeschwächter oder uneigentlicher Diphthong"). Dindorf in these pieces—*e. g.*, d. d. S. c. 7, and *De Astr.* c. 3—always corrects to *θωμ-*; in the Ionizing dialogues, however, as in the *Vitarum Auctio*, c. 6, he writes *θωμαστή*, although he writes *ιποί* for *ιεποί*. Arrian also gives the form *θῶμα*, c. 34, 10; 40, 5 (ex Codice).

*Interchange of Vowel-Sounds. a for η.* In *Arr. Ind.* c. 9, 10 *πολυπραγμονέστατον*, and c. 43, 10 *πολυπραγμοσύνης*, occur for Herodotean *πρηγ-*.<sup>1</sup> Again c. 30, 9, *σιαγόστ* for *σιηγόστ*; finally c. 4, 6, 16; 5, 2 *νανοίπορος*, which is a *twofold* departure from the Herodotean form *νηνοιπέρητος*.

*a for ε.* *Arr. c. 9, 5; 22, 9* has *τεσσαράκοντα* for *τεσσεράκοντα*, and c. 13, 2; 21, 13 *τέσσαρες* for *τέσσερες*. So in c. 8, 6 he has *ἄρσενας* for *ἔρσενας*. Dind. in his Tauch. edition emends *De Astr.* c. 11, *ἄρρενα* and *ἄρρενες*, the late form, to the classic form *ἄρσενες*, etc. It is hard to see what is gained by this.

*ε for a.* *Arr. Ind.* presents pretty uniformly the Attic forms of *τέμνω*—*cf. c. 2, 2; 11, 10; 13, 12; 20, 10*—but the Ionic forms of *τρέπω*. In the Lucianic pieces Dindorf has emended similar slips.

*ε for η.* In Arrian is found throughout the form *ἔως* (the East) for *ἡώς*, and *ἔώσ* for *ἡώσ*, and *ἔωθεν* for *ἡώθεν*—*e. g.*, 2, 1; 2, 7; 3, 3, 4; 5, 2; 26, 6, etc.

In d. d. S. c. 17 occurs the form *κατενεχθῆναι*; the Herodotean form is *κατενειχθῆναι*. So in *De Astr.* c. 15 *κατηρέχθη* for *κατηνείχθη*; *cf. Hdt. I 66, 84; II 116, 121 (fin.)*, etc. (Dindorf takes no notice of these forms.)

*ει for ε.* Arrian H. I. c. 14, 9 the form *βόειον* occurs: Hdtean. is *βόεον*. So c. 25, 7 *ἀποδεδειγμένον* for *ἀποδεδεγμένον*, and c. 33, 8 *δείξειν* and *ἔδειξε* for *δέξειν* and *ἔδεξε*. Dindorf notices and corrects the similar un-Herodotean form *ἔπέδειξε* in d. d. S. c. 25.

*ι for ει.* *εἴκελος*—*ἴκελος* in *De Astr.* §§10 and 20, and d. d. S. §§25 and 33, D. fluctuates and Stein and Abicht disagree, the former preferring *εἴκελος*—*cf. Herod. III 81, and VIII 8*—where the MSS agree in giving this latter form.

*ει for ι.* In *Arr. H. I. c. 1, 6* occurs *εὐθύς*: Hdtean. *ιθύς*.

*ιε for ι.* *Arr. H. I. c. 18, 12* *ιερήια* (Dübner for *ιερεῖα*), Hdtean. *ιρήια*, *cf. De Astr. c. 7*, Dind. corrects *ιερά* to *ιρά* and *ιερώτατον* to *ιρότατον*. One codex here gives *ιρώτατον*.

<sup>1</sup> C. XXXIV, Dübner pref. *πρήγματα ex Codice.*

*ov vs. o.* In Herodotus editors usually (e. g., Abicht) write οὐνομάζω on the analogy of the substantive οὖνομα. In Bk. I 86, however, ὄνομάσαι; and Stein so edits; cf. his Uebers. des Dial. p. 52: "οὐ für ο . . . οὖνομα (aber ὄνομάζω, ὄνομαίνω)." Arr. H. I. c. 1, 5; 21, 10; 27, 1 has the common form ὄνομάζω. So Dindorf in his Commentatio, etc., corrects De Astr. c. 23, but writes ὄνομάζειν in his text.

*ε for ει:* ἔνεκα and ν ἐφελκυστικόν. Arr. H. I. has εῖνεκα once;<sup>1</sup> elsewhere (e. g., 15, 5; 23, 4) ἔνεκα. Dindorf, Commentatio de Dial. Herod. p. 35, says: "Ἐνεκα praepositionis duae tantum in codicibus Herodoti formae reperiuntur, εῖνεκα et εῖνεκεν, eaeque ante consonantes pariter atque vocales. Ego ubique εῖνεκεν scripsi, formarum Ionicarum εἰτεν et ἐπειτεν analogia commendatum. Apud Lucianum (d. d. S. c. 33 et 39) τοῦνεκα pro τοῦ ἔνεκα."

In this connection it may be worth while to speak of the usage of the ν ἐφελκυστικόν in the pieces under discussion. It occurs frequently in the Lucianic pieces, but Dindorf omits it; in Arrian it is sometimes used. Editors usually consider it entirely foreign to the usage of Herod. Erman, however, St. V, p. 278, De Tit. Ionic. Dial.,<sup>2</sup> says that the Ionic inscriptions show that the insertion of the ν was on the whole more common than its omission, and concludes that its use fluctuated very much as in Attic. It may be noticed in connection with the ν form of ἔνεκα—i. e., εῖνεκεν—that we have here an additional ground against drawing *a priori* conclusions in favor of an inordinate love on the part of the Ionians for combinations of vowel-sounds under all circumstances.

"*i demonstrativum.*" Arr. H. I. c. 3, 3 has ταντησί. νννί, Bk. VII 229, is the only example in Herodotus, and Dindorf, d. d. S. c. 23, emends ταντί to ταντό (writes, however, in his Tauch. text ταντό).

*Aspirates.*<sup>3</sup> d. d. S. c. 16 κάθηται for κάτηται. So in Arr. c. 6, 9 οὐχ for οὐκ; and frequently in Arrian αθήσ for αθίσ; so ἐνταῦθα Arr. c. 21, 12; 42, 1, etc., for ἐνθαῦτα; and c. 37, 8 ἐντεῦθεν for ἐνθεῦτεν; the remaining one of this group of three—χιτών—is written where it occurs once (c. 16, 2) in the proper Herodotean form κιθών.

<sup>1</sup> *Vid.* Dübner, preface: "Semel legitur οὐρέα (in Codice 11, 11), semel οὐρόι, pro δροι (c. 40, 11), semel εῖνεκα (c. 33, 9), semel μέγαθος (in Cod. c. 29, 10), semel τραποίατο (c. 12, 12), ad horum normam non sum ausus centena loca refingere, quamquam credo Arrianum his formis esse usum."

<sup>2</sup> p. 279 . . . Tantum igitur abest, ut dialectus ubique illud ν neglegat, ut vel frequentissimus videatur fuisse illius usus.

<sup>3</sup> For aspirates in Ionic inscriptions, cf. Karsten, §3.

*Pronouns.* In d. d. S. c. 51 occurs the form of the rel. pron.  $\delta\tau\varphi$  for Hdtean.  $\delta\tau\epsilon\varphi$ ; so frequently in Arr. Ind. both in gen. and dative—*e. g.*, c. 1, 6; 23, 5, etc. Also the indef. pron.  $\tau\varphi$  for  $\tau\epsilon\varphi$ , c. 5, 13, etc.

*Verbal Forms.* In d. d. S. c. 7 sqq. Dindorf corrects  $\gamma\iota\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  to  $\gamma\iota\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ . In Arrian's H. I. (*e. g.*, 3, 8; 28, 4) the latter form occurs throughout, but this coincidence with the Ionic form may be owing to the fact that  $\gamma\iota\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  from Aristotle onwards (cf. Veitch) usurps more and more the place of the Attic prose form. With the use of  $\gamma\iota\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  compare that of  $\mu\iota\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  H. I. §4, 16; for Herodotean form  $\mu\iota\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  cf. Veitch. In a second passage, indeed (§17, 3), we find the latter form. In d. d. S. c. 21 the aor. mid.  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\mu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  is Epic and late (Veitch). Hdt. uses the second aor.  $\epsilon\mu\alpha\eta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ . Also in c. 53, 55, the late aor. mid. (Veitch)  $\xi\upsilon\mu\alpha\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  and  $\epsilon\zeta\eta\mu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ , Herod. uses the act  $\epsilon\zeta\eta\mu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ .

*Verbs in -μι, ειμι.* Very noticeable is the use of the Epic infinitive  $\epsilon\mu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  for  $\epsilon\iota\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  (*cf.* Dind. Com.) both in the d. d. S. and once in the De Astr. c. 26.

While this form is un-Herodotean, we find it in the oracle delivered to Croesus in the familiar passage B. I. 86. Arrian does not use it, but Aretaeus does (see above).

In d. d. S. c. 25 the poetical form  $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  is used for  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  (*cf.* Hdt. III 134), and in De Astrologia, c. 5, Attic  $\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  for  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ . So Arr. 19, I  $\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ .

$\iota\sigma\eta\mu\tau\alpha\iota$  and  $\tau\iota\theta\eta\mu\tau\alpha\iota$ . In d. d. S. c. 6  $\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  for  $\iota\sigma\epsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ , also Arr.  $\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  c. 7, 9, etc. So in De Astrol. c. 7  $\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  for  $\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  (*cf.* Stud. VIII, p. 189).

$\epsilon\iota\mu\tau\alpha\iota$ . d. d. S. 28  $\eta\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  for ( $\eta\iota\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ )  $\eta\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  (Veitch, p. 204). Arrian has the ordinary Attic form  $\epsilon\pi\eta\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ , 24, 7; 36, 9, etc.  $\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  d. d. S. 25 may be compared with  $\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  Herod. II 26, V 51.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

## V.—A HAGIOLOGIC MANUSCRIPT IN THE PHILADELPHIA LIBRARY.

Somewhat more than a century ago three Greek manuscripts were presented to the Library Company of Philadelphia by Henry Coxe, Esquire, of England. They are preserved in the Ridgway Branch of the Company's Library. One is a large early cursive, on vellum, containing a number of Chrysostom's Homilies. The titles and many Scripture passages are written in uncials. Another, on parchment, contains a large portion of the Lexicon of Zonaras. The third, which is the subject of this communication, is written on paper, dates probably from the fourteenth or the fifteenth century, and contains a collection of hagiologic material such as was read in monastic oratories on saints' days.

It consists at present of 130 leaves, leaf 39 being torn away, except a small corner at the top; each leaf  $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$  inches in dimension; and is bound in half-leather with marbled paper sides. The margins appear to have been not cut down, but are worn away so much as to have lost, either in whole or in part, many marginal numbers. Many of the leaves had to be mounted on a slip for binding, and thus many more marginal numerals, with rubricated initials, have been lost. Many of these initials (but no numerals) have been supplied in red by a hand which shows that the binding was done while the MS was in Greek hands. The lettering on the back, however, was doubtless put on in England or Ireland, for it reads "MSS. Greek Commentary." The number of the MS in the Library is 1141. I believe it has never been examined before since it came into the Library Company's possession. A note in later Greek script at the top of the first page reads *κτῆμα τῆς σεβαστῆς μονῆς . . .*, the name of the monastery being undecipherable, except that it ends in *-αρίου*. The writing occupies a space about  $8 \times 6$  inches in dimension on each page, usually 30 lines, but sometimes only 29. The writing is a cursive, a little coarse, hung from the lines, with a quite moderate amount of ligatures and *compendia scribendi*, but very few of the ligatures are complicated. The principal chapters and sections of the MS commence with ornamental red initials in the margin. Smaller divisions have smaller initials in the text. It is an easy cursive to

read, though it abounds in *iotacisms*, often exchanges  $\sigma$  and  $\omega$ , is not very precise in its breathings and accents, sometimes replaces  $\nu$  by  $\beta$ , and actually now and then exchanges  $\mu$  and  $\beta$ . (This last exchange is actual, and not a mistake from the well-known similarity of the forms of these two letters in certain kinds of cursive.) *Iota* subscript rarely occurs, except where supplied by a later hand. The contents of the MS show that two leaves are now missing at the beginning and one at the end of the MS. The contents are as follows:

1. (Fol. 1-66b.) A recension of the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis in Cappadocia, differing considerably from those in print. It commences, as the MS now is, with the word  $\epsilon\xi\alpha\rho\tau\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$  in the last sentence of the Proemium, and, after the end of this sentence, inserts a table of contents of the *Historia* which fills 4½ pages, containing a little more than 170 items or titles. For nearly eighty of these titles the table corresponds with the text of the *Historia* given in the MS (but as there are slips in the numbering of both table and text it is hard here to be exact), but for the rest of the table its items diverge from the matter of the text. Also, this remainder of the table corresponds, as to most of its items, with the matter in the latter part of the *Historia* as given in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XXXIV, but not in the same order. The table, therefore, is in a measure independent of the rest of the MS, and was not compiled specially for it. It represents some recension of the *Historia* different from both the MS and the printed editions.

After the table of contents follow the two letters of Palladius to Lausus which give the name to the *Historia*; but the first one has no title, and the second has the title which in Migne is applied to the first:  $\alpha\nu\tau\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\tau\omega\eta\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta\lambda\alpha\sigma\omega\pi\rho\pi\sigma\sigma\tau\omega\pi\pi\alpha\pi\alpha\delta\omega\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\kappa\pi\pi\omega\nu$ .

On fol. 6a begins the *Historia* proper, coinciding with the table of contents, and pretty well with the recension in Migne (though with many transpositions in the latter portion), for about 112 of its sections, or 76 chapters of Migne (the sections in the text of the MS, as well as the items in the table of contents, are generally less extensive than the chapters in Migne); but for the rest of the *Historia* the MS has different recensions of portions of its own preceding matter, together with matter found in the *Appendix ad Palladium* as given in Vol. LXV of Migne, and other matter coincident with portions of the *Acta Macarii*, the *Paradisus Patrum*,

etc. Some of the matters, as the visit of the Abbot Macarius to the paradise made by Jannes and Jambres, I feel sure have never been printed. It would seem that the scribe or compiler of the MS passed ignorantly or insensibly into other matter akin to the Historia. The colophon at the end reads: *ἐώς φθε ἡ καὶ αἴγυπτον μοναχῶν ἱστορία*; and this latter title is one of those usually applied to the *Paradisus Patrum*, while the Historia, which dates A. D. 420, is an account of the journey of Palladius among the churches and monasteries of Egypt, of the wonderful things he saw, and of the wonderful stories he heard, while there. It may be further mentioned, in this connection, that much of the following matter of the MS consists of narratives or chapters introduced as if by a traveller relating his adventures. Also, that the marginal numbering of the text of the MS ceases with the number 73; at which point, furthermore, begins the breaking up of the correspondence in *order*, or sequence, between the matter of the MS and that of Migne. At only one other place in the MS Historia are numbers supplied, and those are at the seven days which ended Palladius's journey in Egypt.

I shall elsewhere publish the coincidences and divergences of the matter of the MS with that in Migne, and therefore omit here the necessary tables.

2. (Fol. 66b.) After an ornament extending across the page in red, black and green, begins, with an elaborate and elegant red initial, the *βίος τοῦ ἀββᾶ παύλου θηβαίου*; followed (on fol. 70a), apparently as part of the same general matter, by a chapter *περὶ ταξιώτου*; and then (fol. 71b) by another, less closely connected, *περὶ φιλεντόλου δλυμπίου*. This section I do not thus far find in print, though most likely it is to be found in the *Eccl. Graec. Monumenta of Cotelerius*. It ends with fol. 72a.

3. On fol. 72b, after an ornament in red and black, and with a large red initial, begins *διηγήματα καὶ νονθεσίας ὁσίων πατέρων περὶ κατανίγεως*. This is one of the collections of *Apophthegmata* or *Gerontika* so common in monastic MSS, of which probably no two are alike. It consists of about a hundred items, varying from a narrative of several pages to a saying of two or three lines. I have not thought it worth while to attempt to identify them all in print, but I came upon more than half of them while searching for other matters. A few of them seem to me to be not extant in print. As with other portions of the MS, many of these *Gerontika* are of a different recension, or attributed to a different father from those in print. Details I shall publish elsewhere.

4. On fol. 94a, after the close of the last division, and another ornament in red and black extending across the page, begins the treatise *περὶ ἀββᾶ μακαρίου πολιτικοῦ*, which is the commencement of another collection of Gerontika, containing about forty sayings and narratives, which are usually longer than those in the preceding collection. (It may not be superfluous to state here that the name Gerontika comes from the phrase *εἰπεν γέρων*, and others similar, with which so many of the stories or sayings commence. The Greek title is usually either *γεροντικά*, *βιβλος γεροντική*, or *βιβλίον γεροντικόν*.) Many of these in the second collection I have identified. They, with those of the first collection, are to be looked for in the Appendix ad Palladium, the Acta Macarii, the Apophthegmata, etc., in Vols. XXXIV and LXV of Migne. Some of them, however, are so remote as in the *Pratum Spirituale* of Joannes Moschus, to be consulted in Migne, Vol. LXXXVII 3.

5. After the conclusion of the last, on fol. 106b, occurs: *τοῦ ἐν δύοις πατράσι ήμῶν ἀθανασίου πατριάρχου ἀλεξανδρείας σύγγραμμα διδασκαλίας εἰς πάντας τοὺς μονάζοντας καὶ πάντα εἰσεβῆ χριστιανόν*. It is the same treatise with that in Migne XXVIII 4, Coll. 835, 836, though there called *σύνταγμα*. Its chief coincidence with the *Διδαχὴ τῶν ιεροτόλων* is in the MS clearly marked as a *quotation*, though whether directly from the *Διδαχὴ* or not I do not propose here to discuss. The words run thus: *ἀξιών σε αὐτὸν εὐτέρεπιζε προβεβλημένος, ἀγαπητέ, ταῦτα φυλάττεν ἀγονίζοντα μετὰ τοῦ κύριου τὸν θεόν σου ἀγαπήσεις ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαντόν οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις, οὐ φαρμακεύσεις, οὐ διχοστατήσεις ἀπέχον πνικτοῦ καὶ εἰδωλωθύτου καὶ αἵματος*.

6. On fol. 109a ends the foregoing, and, after another ornament of red and black, begins *τὰ τῶν προφήτων ὀνόματα, καὶ πόθεν ἡσαν, καὶ ποῦ κεῖνται*. This, though having many agreements with the printed recensions, appears to be inedited. It has a form and style of recension intermediate between the two given in Migne, Vol. XLIII; the one, Coll. 415-418, reprinted from Petavius, who took it from two Coislin MSS of the tenth century, and the other, Col. 393 sq., reprinted from Tischendorf. The order of the prophets is the following: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Zechariah the father of John the Baptist, Elijah the Tishbite, Elisha, Selom and Eli, and Nathan. The MS makes Selom a confusion of Samuel with Ahijah the Selonite, who prophesied to Jeroboam. In Migne, I believe, the name of Selom

refers to the latter only. This treatise is attributed to Epiphanius of Tyre.

7. On fol. 113b, after the conclusion of the last division above, and an ornament, begins a treatise entitled *σύγγραμμα ἐκκλησιαστικὸν περὶ τῶν ὁ μαθητῶν τοῦ κυρίου ὀδοροθέου ἐπισκόπου τύρου, ἀρχαίου ἀνδρὸς πνευματοφόρου, καὶ μάρτυρος γεγονότος ἐν τῷ καιρῷ λυκινίου καὶ κωνσταντίνου τῶν βασιλέων περὶ τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν*. The opening paragraph expands the attribution of this treatise to Dorotheus, stating that it was translated from the Latin of Dorotheus, and adding various particulars; all of which, as in the following treatises attributed in the MS to Dorotheus, are consistent with the usual supposition that the recension or compilation from the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew literary remains of Dorotheus was made by Procopius, Bishop of Tyre. This composition in the MS is almost exactly the same with that in Migne, Vol. XCII, Coll. 1060-65, though with some transpositions, and, in general, a better text. Among the blunders in the text of Migne may be mentioned one which is almost self-correcting, viz. the substitution of *Βαρραθθᾶς* (*sic*) for *Βαρνάθᾶς*. The MS has the right reading. The Seventy are numbered in the margin of the MS.

8. On fol. 115b, after the end of the last treatise, and an ornament, is a composition likewise attributed to Dorotheus originally, but stated to have been compiled from his literary remains, the truth of which is vouched for by John, Bishop of Jerusalem. It consists of two portions—one on the martyrdoms of a number of the Seventy, and other persecutions under Licinius and Constantine; and another (beginning on fol. 17b) on the (Twelve) Apostles. It is substantially that in Migne, Vol. XCII, Coll. 1065 (last paragraph) -1073. Thus Sections 7 and 8 are together in Migne, but in an order the reverse of that of the MS. In the MS the paragraphs treating of the several Apostles are numbered in the margin from 1 to 12.

9. The last treatise in the MS is the *βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῆς ὁσίας μαρίας τῆς αιγυπτίας, τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον ὁσίως ἀσκησάσης, συγγραφῆς παρὰ τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις σοφρονίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἱεροσολύμων*. *λεχθεὶς τῇ ἐ τοῦ μεγάλου κανόνος*. It begins on fol. 119a, after an ornament, and breaks off at the end of the MS in the middle of the word *ξυλά[ριον]*, just so near the end that scarcely a page and a half more would have been needed to finish it. Except the variant readings, it is identical with that in Migne, Vol. LXXXVII, Col. 3697 sq., breaking off in Col. 3724. The date of this composition, if its reputed authorship is the real one, is A. D. 629-38.

It remains only to be said that, throughout, the variant readings of the MS are many, and that many of them are great improvements on the printed texts. It is evident that this MS has never been consulted by an editor of a printed text; and equally evident that it should not be neglected in case any of the texts are reprinted. I have not felt willing, however, to swell the bulk of this notice by citing examples of various readings; the less so as I hope that some student or scholar of more leisure may collate it thoroughly.

ISAAC H. HALL.

## VI.—CORRECTIONS OF THE TEXT OF PARTHENIUS ΠΕΡΙ ΕΡΩΤΙΚΩΝ ΠΑΘΗΜΑΤΩΝ.

The short collection of 36 love-stories, known under the above-mentioned title, besides the interest which attaches to it as a work dedicated to the ill-starred poet Cornelius Gallus, possesses an intrinsic value for the recondite character of some of the legends. It was, probably, well known to the Roman world, as its supposed author, Parthenius, was not only a poet of distinction, comparable with Euphorion and Rhianus (Suet. Tib. 70), but, if the statement of Macrobius (Sat. V 17) may be credited, the guide of Vergil in his Greek studies, and so great a favorite with the Emperor Tiberius that his works, as well as his bust, were admitted *inter ueteres et praecipuos auctores* to the public libraries (Suet. u. s.).

The *περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων* is preserved in only one MS, the *Palatinus* (P), which, after its transference to Rome in 1623, was removed from the Vatican to Paris at the end of the 18th century, and subsequently brought back to Heidelberg in 1815. I have had before me the editions of Heyne (1798), Westermann (1843), Meineke (Analecta Alexandrina, 1843).

VI. τὸν δὲ Σίθονα πρῶτον μὲν κελεύειν τοὺς ἀφικούμενους μνηστῆρας πρὸς μάχην ἵέναι τὴν κόρην ἔχοντα, εἰ δὲ ἥττων φανεῖη, τεθνάναι· τούτῳ τε τῷ τρόπῳ πάνυ συχνοὺς ἀνηρήκει.

Some words appear to have fallen out: perhaps *πρὸς μάχην ἵέναι τινα, ἀθλον τὴν κόρην ἔχοντα, εἰ δὲ ἥττων φανείη, τεθνάναι.*

XI. Some verses of Nicaenetus are cited in which, speaking of Miletus, the father of Caunus, he says:

αὐτὰρ ὁ γε προτέρωσε κιὰν Οἰκούσιον ἄστυ  
κτίσσατο, Τραγασίη δὲ Καλαινέες εἶχετο παιδί·  
ἢ οἱ Καῦνον ἔτικτεν ἀεὶ φιλέοντα θέμιστας·  
γείνατο δὲ ῥαδαλῆς ἐναλίγκιον ἀρκεύθοισι  
5 Βυθίδα, τῆς ἦτοι ἀέκων ἡράσσατο Καῦνος.  
βῆ δὲ φερένδιος φεύγων ὁφιώδεα κύπρον  
καὶ κάπρος ὑλιγενὲς καὶ κάρια ἵρα λοετρά.

In v. 2, *καλαινέες*, which P gives, appears in Heyne and Meineke as *καλαινοῦς*, in Westermann as *Κελαινοῦς*. Celaeno is a name not unfrequent in mythology: three are mentioned in Westermann's

Index. But here the MS points to a quadrisyllabic word, and it would, I think, be more natural to mention the father than the mother. Hence, I should prefer Κελαινός, from Κελαινεύς, a name which occurs in mythology as that of one of the sons of Electryon (Apollod. II 4, 5). Another point of doubt is Τραγασίη. Is it the name of the maiden? If so, it is a very strange one. I suspect it to be an adj. formed from Tragagus, or Craugagus (both forms of the same word; cf. Meineke's Epimetrum II, at the end of his Steph. Byz.), a hero seemingly associated with the Troad (Tzetz. on Lycoph. 232, Etym. M. 763, Paus. X 14, 2). The use of the adj. would be like many similar uses in Latin poetry: it would introduce an extra point of description, adding the name of another ancestor, perhaps with the object of *defining*, where the requirements of verse forbade *stating*, the woman's appellation. Tragagus or Craugagus may have been the remoter ancestor, as Celaeneus was the actual father. But the most doubtful part of these obscure verses is 6, 7: 'Pro δὲ φερένδιος Voss δ' ἐπ' ἥραν Δίας, Diam Cariae urbem esse monens ex Stephano Byz. Δία . . . πόλις Καρίας. Passovius βῆ δὲ πέρην Δίας, Kayserus βῆ δ' ἄφαρ ἔνδιος. Non liquet. Nec Κύπρον sanum est.' So Meineke. I believe myself to have here seen more than any of these critics. Steph. Byz. (p. 541, Meineke) has this article: Πύριδος, πόλις Καρίας τὰ εἰς ὅς καὶ εἰς ἄ εἰς εῦς ἔχει τὸ ἔθνικόν. Hence from Πύριδος, Πυριδεύς. For βῆ δὲ φερένδιος, then, I would read βῆ δὲ Πυριδῆς. But what is ὄφιώδεα Κύπρον? Even if ὄφιώδεα is right, Κύπρον must be wrong, as the other places mentioned with it are Carian. Heyne conj. Κάπρον, for which, however, he quotes no ancient authority. Ptolemy (V 3, 5) mentions a place called Cydna, at the foot of Mount Cragus. This may, I suppose, be the name disguised as Κύπρον in *P*: possibly Nicaenetus called it Cydnus. At any rate, in v. 7, Voss's emendation, Κράγος, is in a high degree probable; as (1) Cragus would be fitly described as well timbered; (2) in MSS the forms which it assumes are manifold, and some of them in a marked sense odd and misleading: *e. g.*, Ov. Met. IX 647, *Cragon* appears in three MSS which I have collated as *chracon*, *graton*, *grathon*. But I confess my doubts as to ὄφιώδεα, for though Cydna might abound in snakes, would Nicaenetus have used, as Strabo 770 seems, ὄφιώδης in this sense? An easy conj., and not an improbable one, would be ὄφρυώδεα 'brow-like,' 'beetling.' The vv., then, as now emended will be:

Βῆ δὲ Πυριδῆς, φεύγων ὄφρυώδεα Κύδναν (?) νον  
καὶ Κράγος ὑλιγενὲς καὶ Κάριοι ἡρὰ λοετρά.

XVII. ὁ δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον οὐκ ἔφη φθερεῖν ἔξενγμένην γυναῖκα ὑπὸ τε νόμων καὶ ἔθων, λίπαρῶς δὲ προσκειμένης τῆς μητρὸς συγκατατίθεται. καὶ ἐπειδὴ νῦξ ἐπῆλθεν εἰς ἦν ἐτέτακτο τῷ παιδὶ, προεδήλωσεν αὐτῷ μήτε λύχνα φαίνειν ἐν τῷ θαλάμῳ, μήτε ἀνάγκην αὐτῇ ἐπάγειν πρὸς τὸ διαλεχθῆναι τι. ἐπὶ προσθεῖσθαι γὰρ ἀντὴν ὑπ' αἰδοῦς.

Heyne, Westermann and Meineke all read ἐπιπροσθεῖσθαι, which is objectionable as an unnecessary heaping up of prepositions, since προσθεῖσθαι in itself means 'to ask besides.' I think the previous προσκειμένης points to ἐπιπροσκεῖσθαι: 'for the woman herself seconded her (*i. e.*, Periander's mother's) urgent appeal from a feeling of shame.'

*Ib.* καὶ ἔως μέν τινος ἐδεῖτο τῆς μητρὸς ἔξικετεῦσαι ἐκείνην, ὅπως τε εἰς λόγους αὐτῷ ἀφίκοιτο καὶ ἐπειδὴ εἰς πολὺν πόθον ἐπάγοιτο αὐτόν, δίλη τότε γεγένηται· νυνὶ δὲ παντάπασι πρᾶγμα ἀγνωμον πάσχειν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐφίεσθαι αὐτῷ καθορᾶν τὴν ἐκ πολλοῦ χρόνου συνοῦσαν αὐτῷ.

The words δίλη τότε γεγένηται are altered in Westermann and Meineke into δίλη πότε γένοιτο. I agree with Legrand and Heyne in retaining at any cost γένηται, which, if Parthenius wrote γένοιτο, would hardly have been substituted for it; and I incline to follow Heyne in retaining τότε, adding γε, which has its proper force, in reference to Periander's proposal of *at last breaking the silence* which his unknown paramour had hitherto observed: 'He begged his mother to prevail upon the woman to exchange words with him, and, since she was now leading him on to strong love, to use that occasion (τότε γε) for at last revealing her person to him.' The subjunctive would imply, I suppose, that this was the part of the request which was nearest to Periander's heart, and which he realized more immediately than the mere conversation which was to accompany and precede it.

XXI. It seems worth while to call attention to the coincidence of *name* in this story of the Methymnaean Peisidike, who betrays her country to Achilles, the sight of whom has inflamed her love, with the virgin of the Asiatic Pedaesus, who, when Achilles is laying siege to the town, falls in love with him, and by means of an apple inscribed with the words

μὴ σπεῦδε Ἀχιλλεῦ πρὶν Μονηίαν ἔλγε·  
ῦδωρ γὰρ οὐκ ἔχουσι· διψῶσι(ν) κακῶς·

suggests to him to reduce the town by making himself master of the spring Monenia (Schol. Il. VI 35). This same legend, I incline

to believe, lurks in one of the obscurest allusions in Ovid's Metamorphoses, VII 465 sqq.:

Marmoreamque Paron, quam quae impia prodidit Arne  
Sithonis, accepto quod auara poposcerat auro,  
Mutata est in auem, quae nunc quoque diligit aurum  
Nigra pedes, nigris uelata monedula pinnis.

For so MSS lead me to write this passage (see Cambridge Journal of Philology, XII 74). It would be quite in accordance with the shifting character of this kind of legend to suppose that as the name Peisidike is transferred from one place to the other, so the name Monenia reappeared in some Roman form of the story as Monedula; the spring by which Pegasus was betrayed becoming the bird into which the traitor maiden was metamorphosed. If so, the hero of the Parian story may be, as in the other two cases, Achilles. But this is a mere suggestion on which I would not lay much stress.

XXIV. Ἰππαρίνος δὲ Συρακοσίων τύραννος εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀφίκετο πάνυ καλοῦ παιδός· Ἀχαιός αὐτῷ ὄνομα. τοῦτον ἐξαλλάγμασι πολλοῖς πείθει τὴν οἰκίαν ἀπολιπόντα συν αὐτῷ μένειν.

In Liddell and Scott's Lexicon *ἐξαλλαγμα* is explained as 'recreation,' 'amusement,' from the derived meaning of *ἐξαλλάττειν* = *τέρπειν*, and a verse of Anaxandrides (fr. 20 Kock) is cited. Kock there quotes Phryn. Ecl. 363: *ἐξαλλάξαι τὸ τέρψαι καὶ παραγαγεῖν εἰς εὐφροσύνην*, but it is added that the word is only to be used in this sense with caution. In the above passage of Parthenius this meaning would certainly be possible; yet, to my mind, the character of the expression as a whole suggests a different idea—viz.: 'by constant changes of *presents*,' such as the lover in Petronius (85-7) employs to effect his purpose. Among such presents would be the sword which *ἐτύγχανεν αὐτῷ κεχαρισμένος*.

XXXIII. τὸν μὲν Φίλοττον ἐν κυνηγίᾳ διαφθαρῆναι, τὸν δὲ Ἀσσάονα τῆς θυγατρὸς πόθῳ σχόμενον αὐτὴν αὐτῷ γήμασθαι.

For *αὐτὴν* possibly we should read *αἰτεῖν*.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

## NOTE.

### ON *Meridie*, ITS DERIVATION AND EARLY USE.

The ardent defenders of the doctrine of the inviolability of phonetic law, or, to speak with Professor Bloomfield, of the "regularity of phonetic courses,"<sup>1</sup> are sometimes led, in the zeal of their defense, into explanations as startling in their improbability as are to them the isolated exceptions which they seek to explain away.

A striking instance in point, it seems to me, is the attempt of Stowasser, in the *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, Erster Jahrgang, pp. 273-77, to derive *meridie* from *meri die* = in bright daylight, rather than from *medi-die*, the derivation which has been generally received from the time of Varro. Stolz, in his Latin Grammar (p. 174), which fairly bristles with phonetics, accepts Stowasser's view as more probable than that of Varro. Osthoff (*Das Perfect im Indogermanischen*, p. 629) says: "Sodann aber ist hier überhaupt Composition mit *medius* höchst fraglich und viel wahrscheinlicher solcher mit *merus*." Wilhelm Meyer, in a review appearing in the *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, Berlin, 6 Mai, 1885 (II 19, p. 591), declares that "meridies ist jedenfalls ein exemplum 'sui generis,' hat übrigens wahrscheinlich mit *medius* nichts zu thun." This approval by authorities so respectable shows that there is more danger of this derivation's meeting with general acceptance, and finding its way into our dictionaries, than would be at first supposed. It is time for some one to come to the aid of Varro. The absurdity of many of Varro's etymologies has cast discredit upon others, and no one would claim that his opinion is final. But his statement, *De L. L.* VI 4, *D antiqui non R in hoc dicebant ut Praeneste incisum in solario vidi*, is quite another matter. One would suppose such evidence of an eye-witness would be decisive, even if the Skt. *madhyadina*, Gk. *μεσημβία*, German *mittag*, our *midday*, and other analogous expressions, did not speak in its favor. But Stowasser is not convinced. Varro may have invented the example to suit his purpose, or the maker of the sun-dial may have sought to impose upon people with this spelling. Put into a few

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. V of this Journal, p. 178.

words, Stowasser's reason for doubting Varro, and seeking another etymology, is simply this: D between vowels in Latin never passes into R. The Romans, moreover, found nothing disagreeable in a succession of d's; this despite the testimony of Priscian (I, p. 137, Keil): "Ne male sonet alterna d in utraque continua syllaba." They said *dedit, dedidit, dididit, dedidicisse, dedecet, dedecus, dodrans, dudum, Didius*. If any one had said *meridie* for *medidie*, these other words at that moment would have suffered dissimilation of r to d, unless, indeed, some cross-law had come into operation. Again, it would be unscientific to suppose that because final d can change to r, as in *ar apor* (and d before f and v and b, as in *arvena, arfari, arbiter*, etc.), medial d can ever become r. But no one will deny that a certain kinship of sound is hereby proved, which is what Donatus asserts in a passage which has escaped the notice of Stowasser, namely, ad Adelph. V 3, 62.

*Meridie ipso faciam ut stipulam configat* "et nomen fecit de adverbio. *Meridiem* dixerunt veteres, quasi *medidiem*, r pro d posita propter cognitionem inter se literarum."

Of course it would not be pertinent here to refer to the Umbrian change of d to r (rs) in *peri, persi* (= *pede*), *dupsus, calersu*, etc., for Umbrian is not Latin; nor would it be scientific to adduce vulgar forms in modern Greek (as κλαρί = κλαδί, κλάρα, κλαρώνω, Ἀριστείρης for Ἀριστείδης, heard in Crete; cf. Foy, Laut-System der griechischen Vulgarsprache, p. 43); nor even to cite Spanish *lampara* = *lampada*, Neapolitan *pere* = Italian *piede*, Lat. *pedem*, Neapolitan *rurece* = *duodecim*, Italian *mirolla* = *medulla*, although here the continuity in history between the Latin and Romance languages might be appealed to, and the unscientific might easily be persuaded that if *medulla* (from *medius*) could become *mirolla*, *medidie* at a much earlier day might have been pronounced *meridie*, and, once so pronounced, might have been protected from reverting into *medidie* by the analogically formed *pridie* and *postridie*. No, if we would be truly scientific, we must produce some example of D in Latin actually becoming R between vowels. Fortunately, we are able to do this. Not to speak of *Ladinum* and *Larinum*, where the priority of *Ladinum* may be disputed (cf. Sandys, Cicero Orator, 157, note by Reid), we have *IRUS* (for Idus), Rossi 48 (338 A. D.), and *FERELEZ* (Fidelis) IRN 6700, both cited by Seelmann (Die Aussprache des Latein, p. 311). Stolz, Lat. Grammatik, p. 174, although he distrusts *meridie*, proclaims "maredu" (Loewe, Prod., p. 353, taken from Cod. Vossianus,

fol. 82) "neben *madidus*" as "ein ganz sicheres Beispiel." A still better attested example, which has escaped the notice of Stoltz and Seelmann, is to be found in Captivi 999, where Brix, Sonnenschein, Ussing, and other editors, read with all the MSS *monerulae* for *monedulae*, and in Asin. 694, where, on the authority of the best MSS, Goetz, Loewe and Ussing read *monerulam* for *monedulam* (found in E<sup>3</sup>FZ.) ; cf. Lachmann, Lucretius III 1011. Without seeking to defend the etymology, we may also notice Isidorus XII 7, 69 : "*Merula* antiquitus *medula* vocabatur eo quod *moduletur*, Alii *merulam* aiunt vocatam quia sola volat, quasi *mera* volans." Here the kinship of *r* and *d* is distinctly recognized, although Stowasser ridicules the form *medula* as a sheer invention. Yet Isidorus is the only ancient grammarian who gives *merus* + *dies* as a possible derivation for *meridies* ; cf. III 41, 3 : *Meridies autem vocata, vel quia ibi sol facit medium diem quasi medidies, vel quia tunc purius micat aether. Merum enim purum dicitur.* Similarly, V 30, 15 ; XIII 1, 6. In XVII 7, 2, *medidies* alone is given.

Among modern writers, the Rev. James Davies (Weale's Classical Series) may claim priority over Stowasser in championing the derivation of Isidorus. In his note to Adelphi V 3, 59, he calmly says "Varro and Donatus wrongly derive *meridies* from *medius* and *dies* 'quasi *medidie*.' It is derived from 'merus dies.'"

The ancient passages supporting the derivation from *medidies* (Varro L. L. VI 4 ; Cic. Or. 47, 157 ; Quint. 1, 6, 30 ; Nonius Marcellus, pp. 60, 451 ; Priscian IV §34 ; Velius Longus, Keil, VII 71) are too well known to be quoted here. So far as the meaning is concerned, no one, I think, will deny that a locative *medi die* is much more probable than *meri die*. We find *luci claro* used by Plautus, but not *luci clari*.

A few words now about the form. Stowasser recognizes that it is not properly a compound, but two distinct words, *meri die* (as we should say *medi die*), forming a locative like *pridie*, *postridie*, and the forms *die quinti*, *die pristini*, etc., attested by Gellius X 24. We should, consequently, not expect *meridie* to be declined any more than *pridie*. The remark of Donatus quoted above, "et nomen fecit de adverbio," is suggestive in this connection. The first step toward declension was probably taken when a preposition like *ante* or *post* was used before *meridie*, just as we have *ante diem sextum Kal. Apr.* standing for *ante die sexto*, where *ante* has forced *die* into the acc. According to Gellius and Censorinus,

*ante meridiem* and *post meridiem* were found in the Laws of the XII Tables (see ed. Schoell, p. 118 f.). There are three passages in Plautus where the editors give the accusative:

Pseud. 1174, *Ex Sycione pérvenisti huc? áltero ad meridiem.*  
*meridie* F, *mediem* B.

Most. 582, *Quod si híc manebo pótius ad meridiem.* *meridiem*  
Ba, according to Ritschl.

Most. 579, *Abeám? Redito huc círciter meridiem.* *meridie*  
BCD, M in fine versus apparuit (in A).

*Círciter*, however, may be regarded as an adverb, and the form *meridie* retained, just as in Nonius Marcellus, p. 451, where Varro is quoted, the MSS give *círciter meridie*, which is kept by Stowasser (Quicherat reads *meridiem*). The evidence for the acc. in Plautus is, therefore, not very abundant. As for the nom. *meridies*, I think there is room for doubt whether it was used as early as the time of Plautus. The editors give it in Most. 651 *heus, iam adpetit meridies*, but the MSS all have *meridie*, and the emendation is due to Saracenus. Terence uses *meridie* only once. It would be difficult to say when *meridies* first appeared, and I cannot here enter into the later usage. I subjoin a few examples of the use of the nom. *meridies*: Varro L. L. VI, 4 (where he discusses the etymology); Caesar B. G. VII 83; Censorinus, c. XXIV; Pliny N. H., VII 212; XVIII 326. It occurs also in the grammarians. *Postmeridiem* and *antemeridiem* are both given as adverbs by Charisius 187, 34, and Georges remarks that the Notae Tironianae 74 give *antemeridie* and *postmeridie*. In Vegetius, according to the critical apparatus of Lang, p. 15, 1, *postmeridie* is read in II, p. 50, 19 *post meridię* A, *meridiaę* M; p. 55, 14 *post meridie* AMG.; p. 84, 10 *post meridie* M. Here the *m* may have fallen off or *meridie* may have been treated as indeclinable. Other evidence of this I have not discovered, unless, indeed, Varro R. R. 1, 2: "Aestivo die, si non diffinderem meo insiticio somno *meridie*, vivere non possem," can be so considered. In De Vit's Lexicon *meridie* here is considered a neuter. Keil, however, emends to *aestivom diem*.

M. WARREN.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

### RECENT BOOKS ON THE HOMERIC DIALECT.

- I. Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt von AUGUST FICK. Göttingen: First Part 1885; Second Part 1886.
- II. The Growth of the Homeric Poems, by GEORGE WILKINS. Dublin, 1885.
- III. Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer, by THOMAS D. SEYMOUR. Boston, 1885.

The publication in 1883 of a theory of the genesis of the Homeric poems—the most revolutionary that has appeared since the days of Friedrich August Wolf—in "Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt" of Fick, revivified the interest attaching to the problem of the Homeric dialect, the solution of which is of such far-reaching importance to the critical historian of literature, to the student of the Greek epopee, and to the investigator of the dialects of Hellas. The study of Homeric forms received, upon the promulgation of this theory, a renewed stimulus; and the number of publications which owe their *raison d'être* to this, the *κατ' ἐξοχήν* most startling innovation upon the traditional doctrines of the supereminence of Ionic genius in the cultivation of epic poetry, offers a new proof of that keen acumen connate with daring boldness, and that power to govern linguistic phenomena, which the Göttingen professor has heretofore displayed in fields of investigation embracing a wider horizon.

Conscious of the Jacobinism of his views, Fick was prepared to meet the antagonism or even the vituperation (for the student of the *literae humaniores* is upon occasion *inhumanissimus*) of the classical philologists of the *stare super vias antiquas* type, whose judgment he considered valueless, since they seemed to him to possess neither an adequate knowledge of Greek morphology nor a keen insight into the interrelation of the Greek dialects, the intermixture of which in the Homeric poems he has been, according to many, the first to successfully explain. At the outset he made the announcement that he would attempt to repel only those attacks which seemed to imperil the cardinal features of his theory, which are, in brief, as follows:

Tradition bears manifold witness to an Aiolic Homer, and the authority of Dicaiarchus, the scholar of Aristotle, may well be invoked when he gives utterance to the assertion that the Homeric poems were originally Aiolic. That Dicaiarchus was correct is proved by an examination of the peculiar position occupied by the traces of Aiolic influence in Homer. The Aiolic ingredients embedded in the grotesque mixture of Hellenic and barbarous forms preserved in our texts, do not owe their existence to an original design on the part of the Ionic *πονηραῖ* to tinge a creation of their genius with an

Aiolic coloring which should recall the memories of a far-off Aiolic epos which had perished in the wrack of time. These Aiolisms owe their admission into our present text to the fact that the Ionians, when they received the epic forms from the original composers, the Aiolians, and translated the poems into their epicoristic dialect, either had no metrical equivalents for these Aiolic forms or did not possess the words in question (*e. g.*, θεά). The hypothesis of an Aiolic Homer is thus, according to Fick, elevated beyond any doubt by the possibility of a retranslation into the original Aiolic, those Ionisms which do not submit to such a retranslation being found in passages which are the production of Ionic Homerids, and branded as spurious by the consentient verdict of the Ὀμηρικῶται of ancient and modern criticism.

It is not the purpose of this notice to subject to a detailed examination from the point of view of diplomatic criticism a theory of such far-reaching consequence. For the present at least we propose to collect, and submit to a brief examination, such of the results of Fick's investigations as are of significance for the science of Greek dialectology.

According to Fick, the present text of the Iliad, which rests on an Attic recension dating shortly after 500, is sutured together out of the following pieces:

I. Μῆνις Ἀχιλλέως. A 1-610, 12 lines of B, Θ 55, Δ 57-805, Ο 592-595, 415-418, 716-746, Π 1-155, 212-296, 656-867, Σ 1-315, T about 76 lines, Υ 39 lines, Φ 1-227, 515-611, X 1-394. In all about 2250 lines.

II. Extension of the Μῆνις. Α 575-848, M, N, Ξ, Ο 1-414, Π 155-197, 306-683, 805-817, Ρ 1-761, Σ 82-242, 316-478, 610-617, T 1-39, X 395-515, Ψ 1-257, Ω 3-803. About 4560 lines.

III. Οίτος Ἰλίου. B 48-483, 811-826, Γ, Δ, Ε, Ζ, Η, Θ 1-55. About 2860 lines.

IV. Extension at the hands of the poet who inserted the Οίτος. Θ 55-565, Α 1-57, Ο 415-746, Τ 1-380, Φ 385-513. About 1300 lines.

V. Ionic redaction of Cynaithos of Chios about the middle of the sixth century. Several passages in A and B, B 484-877, in Δ, Ε, Ζ 119-236, Η, Θ, all Ι, all Κ, Σ 483-609, the greater part of Τ, Υ and Ψ 257-849, and in general all passages throughout the entire Iliad which cannot be retranslated into Aiolic. In all about 4850 lines.

The author of the extension of the Μῆνις Fick holds to be a Lesbian, for several reasons: 1. The mention of the dawn spreading its light over the sea, Ψ 227. 2. The exact topographical knowledge of the Troad displayed by the author. 3. The Boeotians, who were settlers in Lesbos, are the first brought into battle. 4. Epic poetry was cultivated at Lesbos—*e. g.*, by Lesches.

The arguments that have led Fick to the conclusion that the Ιλίου οίτος and its extension are the productions of a Cyprian poet are *inter alia* as follows: 1. The name Κύπρις is used for Aphrodite in Ε alone. 2. Ἀργεῖ παντί must comprise Salamis, the metropolis of the Cyprian Salamis. 3. In Δ 275-282 the allusion to Aias and Teukros. 4. The glorification of Salamis, Η 195-199. 5. Cyprian forms: ἀκοστήσας, Ζ 506 (ἀκοστή· κριθή παρὰ Κυπρίους). The infinitive form in φορῆναι is restricted to the dialects of Arcadia and Cyprus; *ιδέ* “and” occurs in prose in the dialect of Cyprus alone, and is found 19

times in the *Olrog* and its extension, twice in the hymn to Aphrodite—which Fick holds to be of Cyprian origin—and in no other hymn, with the exception of that in praise of Demeter, which is composed in a mixed dialect. 6. The tradition that Homer was a Cyprian, Pausan. X 24, 3. 7. The frequent mention of Cyprian heroes.

The *Κατάλογος* was originally Cyprian, but inserted by an Ionian; immovable Ionisms are but few, and found only in the later Ionic additions. The *Πρεσβεία* is younger than the Cyprian redaction of Θ., but can be retranslated into Aiolic, though fixed Ionisms are not wanting. Fick regards the author of the ninth book either as an Ionian who was skilled in the art of using the Aiolic of the older epic, or as a rhapsode who composed in the mixed Aiolo-Ionic of the sixth century, which came into existence after such older portions as the *Μῆνις* had been Ionized. The epic poetry of the Ionians before 550 is genuine Aiolic, but the *Arimaspea* of Aristeas (525 B. C.) is full of immovable Ionisms. The *Δολῶνεια* can be Aiolized, though its author may be one of the older Ionians. The books containing the *Πρεσβεία* and the *Δολῶνεια*, though demonstrably younger than any other portion of the Iliad, cannot, nevertheless, have been the work of a poet without some touch of the divine afflatus. Their late origin leads us to expect the presence of a greater mass of fixed Ionic forms than found elsewhere; that this is not the case is one of the weak positions of Fick's theory, which is ever liable to prove too much (e. g., in the case of the Theoklymenos episode). The Shield of Achilles and the *Ἄθλα ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ* were originally Aiolic, but at a later period intermixed with Ionisms, the handiwork of the redactor; the latter is not older than 680.

The critique of Christ in the *Philol. Anzeiger* XIV fails to grapple with the essential features of the new hypothesis, except where he makes the assertion that the transformation of an Aiolic into an Ionic Homer is without a parallel in the history of literature, and that Greek history offers no instance of such dialect-transformation. Fick attempts to invalidate this statement by transcribing several fragments of Terpander, Simonides, etc., into that original dialect in which he conceives them to have been composed. To escape the charge of having involved himself in a vicious circle, Fick must overthrow the theory of early dialect-mixture as formulated by Ahrens in 1852. A necessary complement to his reproduction of Homer in the Aiolic form must be a review of all early lyric and elegiac poetry in the light of such a hypothesis. Whatever be the result of this investigation, which has already been attempted for Pindar with doubtful success, one fact is certain—the neglect of the study of the Greek dialects on the basis of the epigraphic monuments and in the light of comparative grammar has engendered an almost blind reverence for the authority of Bergk, who not unfrequently presents a heterogeneity of dialectical combinations which is supposed to enhance our admiration for the plasticity of Greek art, but which in reality obscures our vision of the exact relation of melic poetry to the cantonal dialect. Thus we are requested to read with equanimity and to find an indication of the aesthetical conservatism of the Greeks in such a combination of forms as that found in a fragment of Alcman, the chorus-master of the Spartans: *χρόσιον ἀγγος ἔχουσα μέγαν σκήφον | οἴα τε ποιμένες ἔχουσιν.*

A more serious onslaught upon Fick's theory has been made by Cauer

(*Zeitsch. f. Gymnasialwesen* X), who maintains that in those portions of the *Odyssey* which are indisputably ancient, Ionic forms are found for which the Aiolic cannot be substituted—*e. g.*, diphthongs, which came into existence from the expulsion of *F*, as in *παῖς*. Cauer assumes that if, in that stage of the development of the Aiolic idiom represented by Alcaeus and Sappho, *F* was preserved intact at the beginning of a word and as *v* after the augment, it is incredible that it should have disappeared between vowels at the time when Homer was Aiolic, according to Fick. To this it may be replied that inner *F* is not found in Aiolic; that the conjunction of vowels originally held apart by *F* is Aiolic; that Ionic poets use both the open and the contracted forms; and that in other dialects *F* is found between vowels ( $\Delta\iota F\iota$ ) and has disappeared ( $\Delta\iota$ ). Cauer's argumentation is not cogent, since a form like *παῖς* can be Aiolic as well as Ionic. Though the existence of the dual in Homer has been regarded as proof of the Ionic character of his poems, it can be shown that Ionians as well as Aioliens lost the dual in the earliest period of their dialect-life. Finally, Cauer's assertion that *ā*-forms, as *θέά*, *λαός*, *'Ατρείδαο*, are old Ionic (which view is also held by Brugmann), is to be met with the counter-assertion that it would be impossible for the same dialect to possess at the same time the corresponding *η*-forms, *Λευκοθέη*, *ηηός*, *'Ατρείδεω*. (See Bechtel's refutation of Brugmann's statements in a recent No. of *Philol. Anzeiger*.)

Hinrichs, in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, has offered to Fick's theory the objection that *Πέρραος* is the Aiolic, *Πρίαμος* the Ionic form. The analogy of *κόπρια*, later Aiolic *κόπερρα*, fails to militate against the assumption that *Πρίαμος* is also Aiolic.

Perhaps the most salient argument against an Aiolic Homer is the fact that both *āv* and *κέ* are found in our text. In Attica, Ionia and Arcadia *āv* was in use, *κά*, a Doric prose form, in the Peloponnesus and in North Greece (also in Boeotia and Elis), *κέ*, *κέν* in Thessaly, Aiolis and Cyprus. *κε* *āv* is a combination occurring in the dialect of Arcadia alone. Fick assumes that for *κέ* *āv* has been substituted, and shows that in the dialect of the older Ionic poets there occur 21 cases of *āv* for which *κέ* may be substituted, and 22 cases where *āv* is immovable. In Homer, however, their interrelation is different. In the old *Nόστος* of the *Odyssey* the ratio of movable to immovable *āv* is 18 : 4; in the continuation of the old *Nόστος*, the revenge of Odysseus, 30 : 4; in the younger *Nόστος* 7 : 3; in the Telemachy 10 : 3; in the *Mῆνις* 15 : 7; in the extension of the *Mῆνις* 26 : 5; in the *Οίτος* and in the insertions necessary to complete its junction with the *Mῆνις*, *āv* can be replaced by *κέ* by the adoption of occasional conjectures which, in the opinion of Fick, do not seem over-daring. It is evident that the larger proportion of immovable *āv* in the Iliad, the older poem, does not argue much for the correctness of the hypothesis that *āv* has been forced into our text, for the greater part, at the hands of the Ionic rhapsode Cynaithos.

A series of noticeable observations upon Homeric grammar and the inter-relations of the dialects concludes the volume. To the Aiolisms Fick now adds the rhyme established, for example, by reading *-οισι* for *-ονσι*, as in *μάρτυροι ἀμφοτέροισι θέου τοῦ Ολυμπον ἔχοισι*. But Fick does not show that the Aioliens were especially addicted to the use of rhyme, nor is this probable *per se*. Of interest is the differentiation in the dialects of *εἰς* and *ἐς*. *εἰς* Fick holds to

be Aiolic, *ēç* to be Ionic. In the oldest portions of the *Odyssey* and in the *Mῆνις*, *ēç* can be readily eliminated by conjecture. In the case of *Oītōç*, however, *ēç* is frequently immovable, and is regarded by Fick as the Ionic representation of the *iv* of the Cyprian dialect, in which the *Oītōç* and that portion necessary for the insertion of the *Oītōç* in the *Mῆνις* were originally composed. An examination of the epic fragments leads Fick to the conclusion that those which are older than 550 are capable of retranslation into Aiolic—a proceeding impossible in the case of others whose origin must be ascribed to a later date. The 99 ineradicable Ionisms in the 305 verses of the *Βατραχομομαχία* of Pigres of Halicarnassus are indisputable proof of the increasing supremacy exercised over the *epos* by the Ionians, inasmuch as no such proportion is found in any equal number of verses of early origin.

The foundation of Fick's theory of the linguistic form of Greek epic poetry rests upon arguments which he has developed chiefly in his *Odyssee*, where material is adduced sufficient to control his assumptions. This abstract of the results contained in his recension of the *Iliad*, together with some scattered observations thereupon, will be followed at some future date by a criticism of the plausibility of the theory itself.

The volume by Mr. Wilkins, late Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin, is a representative of that tendency in scholarship which is easily satisfied with an artistic compilation of the latest German theories, without affording the unsophisticated the desirable information from what authorities he has amassed his materials. It is therefore not to be expected that he should have enlightened our knowledge of Homeric grammar by any originality of his own. As Niese, Bonitz and Helbig have been drawn upon without notice to the reader for a large portion of his book, it must be regarded as an instance of the art *de s'égarter avec méthode*, or of a surprising eccentricity on the part of Mr. Wilkins, when in Chapter XIII he assures us that Fick is the promulgator of the theory of the origin of the dialect mixture in the Homeric poems which we have sketched above. It would have afforded us some satisfaction if Mr. Wilkins had affixed to his reproduction of pages 1-39 of Fick's *Odyssee* some criticism of his own besides the adjectives "brilliant" and "daring." The student eager to learn of recent work in Homeric grammar will scarcely be satisfied with a summary of a single theory, be it false or true. Of Hinrichs' dissertation, or of Christ's *Ilias*, or treatise *Die Interpolationen bei Homer vom metrischen und sprachlichen Gesichtspunkte beleuchtet*, there is no mention. Mr. Wilkins' "agnostic standpoint" must be very agnostic.

We welcome with pleasure Prof. Seymour's Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer, which contains in a clear and comprehensive form a survey of the cardinal features of the Homeric dialect, fortified by the well-known scholarship of its author. The purpose of this volume is essentially practical—to relieve the commentary of that mass of burdensome details which, when relegated to their proper connection, are necessary to the understanding of Homeric forms. As Prof. Seymour does not claim for his book either exhaustiveness of treatment or a presentation of the material from a thoroughly scientific point of view, it is necessary that he should couch many of his state-

ments in such authoritative language that the tyro in Homer, for whose use the volume is adapted, may build his faith upon the rock that cannot be swept away by the flood of a contemporary criticism which seeks its high-water mark in the pre-Ionic period of the *epos*. No reference can therefore be made to the probable chronology of certain portions of the text, and contractions, etc., must be registered which many scholars either expel from the text as occurring in interpolated passages (*e. g.* *λωτοῖντα* M 283; the termination in *ἀκραῖς* 284 is suspicious) or resolve into the uncontracted forms.

That portion which concerns the dialect constitutes half the volume—the discussion of Homeric style and Homeric syntax occupying pages 1-33, that on Homeric verse pages 81-94—and is admirably adapted to fulfil the purpose of its author; and we do not recollect to have observed the omission of any phenomenon of essential importance to the understanding of the language of Homer.

The interest attaching to any publication that deals with that *crux criticorum*, Homeric morphology, is so great that we beg leave to offer for Prof. Seymour's kind consideration some remarks in reference to a few of his statements which seem to us not incapable of modification.

4 *f.* There are three passages in Archilochus showing the influence of the labial spirant: I 'Ενναλίου ἀνακτος, XXIX 2 ἡ δέ οι κέμη, XCVII 1 ἡ δέ οι σάθη; whereas we read, "No trace appears in Archilochus." Of course these are merely Epic reminiscences; that is proven by the 21 violations of *F* in the other poems of the Parian poet. It is not absolutely certain that the strong form *θέρσος* in *Θερσίης* is Aiolic, although probable enough, since it is found in the Lesbian, Boeotian, Thessalian and Arcadian dialects. The base *θέρσ-* is found in proper names also in inscriptions from Sparta, Athens, Chios, Corcyra, etc.—5 *e.* For ἔννεκα read ἔννεκα with Aiolic *ψιλωσίς*; cf. τούνεκα A 291; βόλεται has the same claim to the epithet "Aiolic" as βόλλεται; cf. βόλα GDS 239, Mitylene, where there is no trace of the second *λ*. This is, as far as I know, the only instance of the reduction in this word. The Arcadian τὸμ βολέμενον GDS 1222, 24, the Cyprian βόλε, and the Pamphylian βολήμενης, prove the Aiolic character of the Homeric βόλεται. The relation of ποὺς to -πος in ἀελάθπος ἀρτίπος τρίπος has not yet been explained. The breaking down of the law that monosyllables should be long by nature or by position, or its infringement by analogy, may suffice to explain the Laconian πόρ and Homeric -πος from \*πῶς, later ποὺς.—6 *e.* ια is not contracted into ι in ἀκοίτις; ἀκοίτις is from \*ἀκοιτι-νς, as δις from \*δινς. We should take as our starting-point an original form rather than an analogical formation in -ας (cf. πόλιας), which finally underwent the violent contraction into ι.—11 *f.* It can hardly be said that apocope was the rule in the Boeotian dialect. Κατά suffers apocope only before the article, πεδά never; ποτὶ is found in ποτιδεδομένον, etc.; ἀνά and παρά, it is true, always elide the final *a*. πρός is not from προτί (which would give a form προσί), but from προτ-ς; cf. ἐν-ς = εἰς, etc.—12 *i.* The so-called "parasitic" τ in πτόλις, etc., is nothing more than an affection of π+jod; cf. βδ from γν+jod in βδέλλω, and φθ from γθν+jod in φθίνω.—12 *j.* The identity of ξίν and σίν cannot be maintained.—12 *l.* The etymology of ίημι from ιίημι is absolutely incorrect, though upheld by Curtius. The γ/σε (cf. σέμεν σάτυς) is now almost universally accepted. ως is not from γώς, but from Fōς, Goth.

svē. Curtius' influence has done much to propagate this widespread belief in the potency of *jod*, which disappeared between vowels as early as the age of Homer (e. g. *τρεῖς*); before vowels it occasionally left in the *spiritus asper* indication of its former presence. The other *jod* (for there were two in Greek originally) became ζ.—12 o. Would it not have been more scientific and equally clear to have said that σ is added in εξ, οὐτας, πάς?—14. The following instances of the occurrence of *F* might well be added: Φηχή, Φέκηλος, Φέρων, Φέθειρα, Φέλωρ, Φετώνος, Φέτης, Φίρις, Φίρος, Φειατ, Φείκω, "seem," Φίδιος, Φοίγυννος.—16 c. ἐνμεδίω Δ 47 is not from -ιης, but from -ιος; cf. ηύκομος: κόμη. The ḥ-stems are occasionally interchangeable with o-stems. Αἰνεια and Βορέω, the other two forms quoted for the contraction of -εω to -ω<āo, occur before a vowel, so we may read ḥ'; cf. 7 d.—18. The statement that with the exception of the i-stems the dative singular ending i is found only *sub ictu*, would have at least left the question open in reference to the i of the dative of those 16 words which have the *ultima* long. It is by no means certain that the i of Latin has anything to do with the i of Greek.—18 p. The theory of the "insertion" of an ε in certain stem-forms of i and v-stems ought not to be further propagated nor to find entrance even into a book designed for beginners.—24 d. The statement in reference to ἀμμε and ημέας is not exact. It is true that ἀμμες may be substituted for ημεις when (1) the latter stands (as in a large majority of cases) at the beginning of the hexameter, where it is followed by μέν, δέ, etc., and when (2) ημεις forms the sixth foot. But ημέας is immovable 19 times (1st foot 9 times, 2d 1, 3d 2, 4th 7, 5th 1). ἀμμε can find entrance into the text of Homer in these passages only in case recourse be had to conjectures, which Prof. Seymour would doubtless stigmatize as savoring of too great boldness. The substitution is feasible seven times. Whatever theory may be held as regards the fortunes of the Homeric epos, it cannot be denied that the statement that ἀμμες ἀμμε are found in our text, where the Ionic dialect presents no metrical equivalents, would at least facilitate the understanding of the tyro.—24 V r. "The stem τι- is drawn into the second declension by the addition of o and τιο- becomes τεο-; cf. πόλιος and πόλεως." This assertion, in which Prof. Seymour agrees with Curtius, Renner and Windisch, is indefensible, since τεο- is original. The palatalization of the guttural does not necessitate the i-coloring of the vowel. As in τεοιο, gen. of the personal pronoun, we have the stem τεο-, so in τέον, Archil. 95. The stem τεο- has, however, nothing whatever to do with τι-. This τι- was extended in the first instance by ν (τι-ν-ός), in the second by o—a phenomenon specifically Aiolic (τιψ, τιοισν, Hesychius δτιοισν). If in Lesbian ε passed with any great frequency into i, we might accept with greater certainty an explanation diametrically opposed to that advocated by Prof. Seymour; at least it is more probable that τιψ is <τέψ—an original and Ionic form—though neither in the dialect of Lesbos nor in that of Aiolis is i <ε very common. Χρίστος, we may remark in passing, is not the ground-form of χρίστος, as has been maintained by Johannes Schmidt. i arises from ε before nasals, σ + consonant, σσ, κ, and frequently before vowels in the dialects of Boeotia, Crete, Laconia, Cyprus, Messenia and Argos. The dialect most closely connected with that of Lesbos which offers an instance of i <ε is the Thessalian. In no case could the i of τιο- become ε. The analogy of πόλιος πόλεως is incorrect. The -εως form is from the analogy of the gen. of nouns in -ευς; πόλιος and πόλεως

are therefore morphologically different forms.  $\tau\epsilon\omega$ - is < $\tau\epsilon\omega$ -=Old-Bactr. *cahyā*. —29 *h*. Emend  $\mu\nu\theta\epsilon\epsilon\alpha$ .—33 *d*. A reference to the conjectural readings  $\delta\alpha\gamma\omega$  and  $\tau\pi\pi\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$  might have been inserted with profit; otherwise the student would fail to understand the similarity in formation of  $\delta\alpha\epsilon\omega$  and  $\delta\alpha\mu\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ . The conjectural readings were adduced 34 *d*.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

Études Critiques sur Properce et ses élégies. Par FRÉDÉRIC PLESSIS. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1884.

There is a sense in which M. Plessis' *Études Critiques sur Properce* may fairly claim to be one of the most important contributions to the subject yet published. For the first time students of Propertius are presented with data for forming a true estimate of the age of the *Neapolitanus*, the debatable point round which all recent criticism has turned. M. Plessis has examined the famous codex with his own eyes at Wolfenbüttel, and has photographed six pages of it; which photographed specimens are given at the end of his volume, and may be said to settle the question of date finally. The authority of the first of French palaeographists, M. Léopold Delisle, as well as M. Chatelain, has pronounced the MS to belong to the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century; and I am able to confirm their judgment by that of our own great expert, Mr. E. M. Thompson, who unhesitatingly assigns it to the end of the twelfth century. It will be remembered that Messrs. Lucian Müller and Bährrens agreed in considering the MS to be much later, the former ascribing it to the fourteenth, or preferably the fifteenth century; the latter not only believing it to be written after 1430, but finding in it traces of unmistakable interpolation. It is satisfactory to be reassured by the incontestable evidence of fact, and to find the conclusions of Lachmann and Keil completely verified by the independent judgment of the first modern authorities in palaeography. All the conclusions which have been drawn from the supposed late date of the *Neapolitanus* must henceforward be considered to be disproved: if the MS is interpolated, such interpolation must be shown to rest on other than palaeographical arguments; if it is *not*, as I, with A. Palmer, Leo and most others, believe, the supporters of its sincerity may henceforward start with one of the most important of all vouchers, its comparative antiquity. By comparative I mean as compared with the other Propertian codices; for none of these can claim a date nearly as early.

M. Plessis, then, deserves our particular gratitude for this signal service, and if his *Études* possessed no other claim to distinction but this, they must on this ground only be allowed to rank far above the numerous *Quaestiones Propertianae* which year after year pour from the presses of Germany. I can truly say that I know few accounts of the MSS of particular authors more interesting for style or matter than the chapter which M. Plessis devotes to the MSS of Propertius; more than anything which I have yet seen, it is calculated to make even listless readers aware of the growing importance of the *res diplomatica*; if indeed this were not sufficiently evident alike from the obvious uneasiness of those who know nothing about it, and the growing suspicion (even in Cambridge) that philology *may*, after all, develop in a non-syntactic direction!

But M. Plessis, a pupil of M. Eugéne Bénoist, writes primarily for Frenchmen, and has, as he candidly confesses in his preface, to rouse an interest which at present is dormant, if not extinct. Therefore it is that his *Études* are many-sided and discuss most of the points in which the poems of Propertius touch popular or literary sympathy. It must seem extraordinary that the countrymen of Passerat, in my judgment the best of all the commentators on Propertius, should, since his time (circ. 1600), have made no solid contribution to the elucidation of his poems. The reason perhaps lies in the very excellence and fullness of Passerat's life-labor: for indeed his commentary is *nil paruum aut humili modo*; it belongs to a great era of Latin erudition, the era of Casaubon, Lipsius, Delrio; and ranges over the whole field of Latin Philology as then known. How small and insignificant by the side of this grand folio the comparatively slight month-work of the much-lauded Scaliger! A few acute remarks, varied with much doubtful interpretation—such is Scaliger's contribution to the study of Propertius. A minute, detailed examination of line by line and word by word—each step illustrated by citations drawn from the stores of a quite unbounded reading—the whole guided and marshalled by a discerning and truly *poetical* judgment—such is the work of Passerat. And yet for one who connects the name of Passerat with Propertius there are perhaps fifty who associate him with the name of Scaliger. But justice, however tardy, comes at last; and the spirit of philological inquiry which Lachmann and Ritschl inaugurated will not be content to repeat the unexamined verdicts which come down to us as part of the tradition of the eighteenth century, but will read and judge for itself. M. Plessis himself, in the chapter which he gives to the editions of Propertius, whether from French modesty, or possibly feeling himself overpowered by the gigantic scale of Passerat's commentary, accords to it a praise which I imagine to be far below its merits. "L'édition de Passerat est une des plus considérables—une des meilleures." I may be permitted, perhaps, as an English admirer of the poet, to express my conviction, founded on a considerable study of Passerat's work, that no subsequent commentary, with the exception perhaps of Hertzberg's, is so indispensable for a thorough knowledge of Propertius' meaning. Unhappily it is now very rare. The fame of the poet (for Passerat was "un charmant poète," Plessis, p. 61, note) has perhaps obscured the consideration of the commentator.

The chapter on the editions is followed by one on the division of the elegies into four or five books. M. Plessis, after an examination of the arguments urged by the supporters of either view, Lachmann, Fr. Jacob, Keil, Paley, Haupt, on the one side, Paldamus, Bährens, Palmer, Postgate, on the other, decides in favor of the MS division into four books. Lachmann's argument, that from II 13, 17, 18:

Sat mea, sat magna est si *tres* sint pompa libelli,  
Quos ego Persephonae maxima dona feram,

what our MSS give as one book should be divided into two, is, perhaps rightly, set aside as forcing into the poet's words a meaning which they need not bear. It is enough, if we suppose that when II 13 was written, Propertius *had the intention* of completing the series of his Cynthia-poems by a third book:

whether any part of that third book was written at the time or not. This is virtually the opinion of Beroaldo as well as of Passerat, and, more recently, of Faltin and Postgate. Plessis, while inclining to this view, mentions with approval another, first maintained by Nobbe, and lately by Voigt, that *libelli* in the above-quoted passage may mean, not collective books of elegies, but single elegies. We might then imagine the poet, in his desire to deprecate pomp or grandeur, expressing himself thus: "I am contented with carrying to Persephone the smallest of death-offerings, two or three of my elegies, and that is all." Plessis goes on to show that the MS division into four books conforms with Nonius' citation of III 21. 14 as from the third book of elegies; whereas Lachmann's division of B. II into two books, one of ten, the other of twenty-four elegies, introduces an inequality which we have no reason to suppose existed in the original arrangement. Finally, Birt's hypothesis that the *Monobiblos* (our B. I) ought not to be included in the numeration, and that the remaining books should be reckoned as four—II = first and second, III = third, IV = fourth—is dismissed as imaginary.

Next comes the question of interpolations. Nine passages, all from the second book, are passed in review, and the objections of Heimreich, Gruppe, and others considered. If the arguments against the genuineness of most of these are to be accepted as the strongest that German criticism has elaborated, I must pronounce the cause to be weak indeed. Almost all of them allow of easy refutation. But here M. Plessis admits that his work is imperfect. For instance, nothing is said about two vv. of the *Pactus*-elegy which in a more than ordinary degree bear an external look of interpolation:

Hoc iuuene amisso classem non soluit Atrides.  
Pro qua mactata est Iphigenia mora.

And it is too clear that Prof. A. Palmer's excellent articles in *Hermathena* have missed the generally penetrating search of our reviewer—an oversight which is the more astonishing as one of the greatest merits of these *Études* is the care with which almost every one who has written on Propertius finds mention in their pages.

Very comic is the view stated on p. 137, as Heimreich's, that the difficult verses, II 24. 1-8—

Tu loqueris cum sis iam noto fabula libro,  
Et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro?  
Cui non his uerbis aspergat tempora sudor?  
Aut pudor ingenuus† aut reticendus amor.  
Quod si tam facilis spiraret Cynthia nobis,  
Non ego nequitiae dicerer esse caput,  
Nec sic per totam infamis traducerer Urbem,  
Vrerer et quamuis nomine uerba darem.

are the composition of a monk. "Je ne sais pas si c'est un moine ou tout autre qu'il faut rendre responsable," remarks M. Plessis, with justifiable amusement; and assuredly, culpable as this much vilipended race may have been, one of their least demonstrable sins is this of inventing verses whose only fault is that they are all but unintelligible. Only fault, I say advisedly, for metrically they are quite Pro-

pertian; the substitution of *ingenuost* for *ingenuus* (Munro, quoted in Cranstoun's translation) is enough to make v. 4 rhythmical, and the connection with v. 3 is sufficiently clear. It seems nearly incredible in an age which professes, like our own, to study, and really does study the documents and style of the Middle Ages, to imagine any classical critic seriously ascribing to a monk these eight verses. Very different are their real forgeries, such, for instance, as the imitation of the *Heroides* published some years ago in the *Rheinisches Museum* by Riese; which no one could for an instant believe to be anything but what it is, a composition, perhaps by a monk, but in any case mediaeval. Quite different, too, is the case of single lines or distichs which bear traces of scriptural allusion, e. g. the well-known *Per tenues ossa sunt numerata cutes*, though even here the chances are strongly against a monkish hypothesis. For my own part, I have never persuaded myself that Lucian Müller was serious in ascribing such an origin to the Propertian

Quare, dum lucet, fructum ne desere uitae,

where *dum lucet* is supposed to be a monkish reminiscence of S. John IX 4, just as in Hor. C. III 18. 12 *pardus* of some MSS is believed by Bentley to be a reminiscence of Isaiah XI 6.

On the tautologous distich, II 23. 23, 24:

Libertas quoniam nulli iam restat amanti,  
Nullus liber erit si quis amare uoleat,

Plessis mentions with approval a view of Fischer's, that our present v. 24 has replaced a lost original. "Ici la probabilité est tellement forte, qu'elle équivaut presque à une preuve"; and he goes on to explain how the substituted verse got on. "Un lecteur quelconque, s'amusant à retourner la pensée contenue dans l'hexamètre, aura fait ce vers et l'aura mis en marge; un copiste l'aura pris pour une variante et le préférer au pentamètre véritable, l'aura maladroitement substitué à celui-ci." No notice is here taken of what I think may be another possibility, viz. that Propertius was consciously imitating the parallelism of Jewish poetry.

I cannot agree with Plessis' view that *Veneres* in II 20. 7—

Aetas prima canat Veneres, extrema tumultus,

is supported by Cat. III 1. In the line of Propertius it means 'joys of love,' in Catullus it is personal. Nor can I accept his version of II 26. 9, 10—

Quae tum ego Neptuno, quae tum cum Castore fratri,  
Quaeque tibi excepti, iam dea Leucothoe !

"que je n'ai-je point alors *promis* à Neptune, promis à Castor comme à son frère,' or the accompanying note suggesting that *excepti* contains the idea of a stipulation. The notion is, I think, of making vows *in succession*, one after another, to Neptune, the Castors, and Leucothoe.

The chapters on the name and country of Propertius, and on the chronology of the poems, are well written, and discuss the points they treat in a systematic way, yet so as not to fatigue the reader. Then follows a study on elegy and its Greek and Alexandrian representatives, concluding with an estimate of Propertius as an elegiac poet. Lastly, the text of three elegies, I 2, III 12,

IV 11, with a full critical apparatus of MS variants and conjectures by successive editors, is given. M. Plessis has himself proposed some new emendations: the most noteworthy of these is in IV 11. 21, which Plessis reads—

Assideant fratres iuxta Minoa, sed astet  
Eumenidum intento turba seuera foro.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

Maxime Collignon: *A Manual of Greek Archaeology*. Translated by JOHN HENRY WRIGHT. Cassell and Co., London, Paris, New York, and Melbourne, 1886.

The title of this book, which awakens confused memories of Otfried Mueller and Bernhard Stark, might injure its circulation, were it not that it appears as one of a series of handbooks adapted to the uses of intelligent students of the formative arts. The potent imprimatur of South Kensington itself is the nearest English equivalent, we suppose, for that of the French Department of Fine Arts, under which the original series was brought out. Wherever what the author can predicate of his own country is true in Anglo-Saxondom—that acquaintance with the monumental side of Antiquity is demanded as the indispensable complement of classical studies—the Manual ought to have a public of literary students as well. The writer has regretted the unavailability of the French text for class-use with English-reading pupils, and was about to undertake a translation, when he found himself forestalled by Professor Wright. German scholars expressed surprise to him that a French work should be preferred. Actually, there is no German work of the same scope extant. The nearest approach is Baumeister's *Denkmaeler des Altertums*, a reference-book in dictionary form, now in course of completion.

M. Collignon, a former member of the French School at Athens, was called from Bordeaux to a chair of archaeology at the Sorbonne not long ago. His disposition of the subject-matter is a simplification of Mueller's systematic arrangement. His books treat in order of the Origin of Greek Art, Architecture, Sculpture, Terra-cotta Figurines, Painted Vases, Numismatics and Glyptics, Bronzes and Jewels. Naturally, these divisions are far from equal in number of pages. Sculpture gets about as many as the other arts together. Chapters and paragraphs take account of the obvious periods, or of local schools, or subordinate technical categories, with much freedom. Indeed, to follow out the author's own comparison, he has reproduced in his printed pages the arrangement of a museum, the administration of which must dispose its collected treasures to best advantage in halls of varying size, form, and illumination. May our good genius preserve us, whether in museums or textbooks, from systems and selections final and invariable! M. Collignon's illustrations hit our mark. The number—one hundred and forty-two—is sufficient to leave the general impression that is the compiler's aim; most of the plates are as large as may be, and, if they do not represent the highest style of graphic art, are fair mechanical reproductions from good pen-and-ink drawings. They grow on the eye with familiarity. The ordinary trade-cuts do not. Finally, a large proportion of the subjects are novel to the general reader, without any artificial discrimination against the famous pieces. He

may recognize old friends in the quoit-thrower of Myron, the fillet-binder of Polycleitos, and the lizard-killer of Praxiteles, but is spared a hundredth repetition of the Aphrodite of Melos or the Apollon of the Belvedere. The Manual has excellences, and faults, that do not belong to the type. It tingles with life, if the opinions thrown out are not always orthodox. This we can say without offence; for the author himself has taken more than one of them back in alterations his translator has made with his sanction. One example will serve. In treating of Phoenician influences, M. Collignon rather boldly assumed a Dorian school of sculpture, which, he says, came particularly under the sway of the Punic models. In the translation this paragraph is suppressed, and we read: "Phoenicia did not possess a style sufficiently original and distinct to impress itself upon the earliest Greek sculptors." But here, as elsewhere, recent discovery has cleared doubts and sharpened outlines that were blurred a few years ago. The author has satisfied himself, for example, that the primitive pottery, etc., found under the volcanic tufas of Thera is of a more recent date than the oldest articles from Hissarlik-Ilios. So the paragraphs are transposed, and "une civilisation analogue, quoique plus récente" (the Trojan) becomes "the earliest civilization." A careful comparison with the original text brings out innumerable minor corrections, where a date, maybe, is changed, or a "possibly" limits a mere conjecture. It is the more surprising that Pheidias and Alkamenes should still be designated, without qualification, as the sculptors respectively of the east and west pediments of the Parthenon. This was a conjecture first emitted, I believe, in Beille's *Acropole d'Athènes*, as an ingenious interpretation of an anecdote related by that absurd old creature Tzetzes. Now that we have authentic works of Alkamenes in the Olympian Centaurs and Lapithai, most of us will consider it inadmissible; certainly it does not belong in a textbook. Damokrates and Anaxagoras, as builders of the theatre at Athens, very properly give way to "architects whose names are unknown." The lists of authorities that head the chapters have been brought up to time, and some titles of older standard books passed by in the French edition have been inserted. Altogether, three titles are suppressed and thirty-one are added; we are glad to notice Middleton's *Grecian Remains in Italy*, etc., an early American work to which the American Journal of Archaeology called attention in its first issue,<sup>1</sup> among the latter. Professor Wright has appended a capital index, in the typography of which artists, subjects, and technical terms are readily distinguished. It will be seen that he has produced an English edition of independent value, which should meet with an extended circulation in schools where the history of art is studied, or ought to be. Scholars who read French will not yet discard the original for the vernacular version. M. Collignon's style is terse, idiomatic, illumined with apt tropes. In Mr. Wright's rendering we miss at times equivalent "sabre-cuts of Saxon speech." "L'Égypte leur était fermée" (p. 24) becomes "Egypt was less known to them" on page 16; "cette civilisation imposante" (p. 26) is rendered simply "Egyptian civilization" (p. 19); "Psametik opens Egypt to the Greeks," "accueillant des pirates Ioniens et Cariens" (p. 27); Wright makes him "subdue" them. "L'opinion commune fait remonter ce monument [the ark of Kypselos] à la xxx<sup>e</sup> olympiade environ" is rendered

<sup>1</sup> Vol. I, p. 3.

"current opinion placed," etc. This opinion is that of modern archaeologists. "Ronde bosse," of course, is "high relief"; this Mr. Wright knows well enough, as is shown by p. 65; but he has rendered it once "round bosses." Colors were applied to architecture sparingly: "suivant le goût des écoles"—"with the better taste of the schools." The translator must be an anti-polychromist! "Le portique des Hermès" is not "the portico of Hermes" (p. 86); nor were *οἱ τρίποδες* a "Street of the Tripod" (p. 96). Such easy writing would hardly justify animadversion, if inexact rendering did not entail serious blunders sometimes, as in Quatremère's notorious mistranslation of a sentence in Strabon which made the Zeus of Pheidias butt his crown against the ridgepole of his temple for over half a century. But there are also felicities of expression not derived from the original: "splaying jambs" (of the treasury-doors at Mykenai, p. 38; "budding Doric" ("le dorique naissant"), p. 20; "stone-cutter," though a tamer, is a truer equivalent of *λυθογός* than the comical turn of "räcleurs de pierre."

A new edition will bring, as we are assured, an advance upon Beulé's *Monnaies d'Athènes* in regard to certain Euboian coins, and perhaps a recognition of the writer's strictures on the pseudo-archaic relief of Herakles Toxotes (Fig. 36),<sup>1</sup> as qualified by Professor Furtwaengler's communication in the last number of the *American Journal of Archaeology*,<sup>2</sup> besides further needed correction of the press.

A. E.

---

Die Aussprache des Latein nach physiologisch-historischen Grundsätzen, von  
EMIL SEELMANN. Heilbronn, 1885. 398 pp.

In the preface the author acknowledges his obligations to Professor Wendelin Foerster, to whom the work is dedicated, and under whose inspiration it seems to have been written.

Since the publication of Corssen's work, so great advances have been made in the field of phonetics, that a new consideration of the entire subject, in which more attention should be paid to the physiological character of sounds, seemed demanded. The attempt is made to set before us the sources, and to distinguish clearly between what is purely hypothetical and what may be regarded as certain and established. The statements of the Latin grammarians have been carefully examined, and many of them are skilfully translated into the technical phonetic terminology of to-day, while more attention is given to the evidence to be derived from the Romance languages than will be found in any previous work. A pupil of both Buecheler and Foerster, the writer has been trained in the best of schools for investigation of this sort. The work bears evidence of the greatest industry in the collection of materials, and still it may be doubted whether, with all industry, so young a man can have sufficient acquaintance with the results of the work of specialists in Latin, Romance and comparative grammar to put them all in the proper relation, and to draw correct conclusions. One might fairly expect more attention to be given to Umbrian and Oscan, and a more detailed acquaintance with the results of Plautine criticism would have saved some errors. The inscriptions have been

<sup>1</sup> See *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. I, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> P. 52.

well studied, much that is new and not to be found in Corssen or Schuchardt having been added, although here and there important material has been overlooked. Not enough weight has been attached to MS readings in matters of orthography.

The treatise begins with a discussion of accent and recombination. After a thorough examination of the testimony of the ancient grammarians, the writer puts himself on the side of those who argue that the Latin accent was essentially a matter of stress, the musical tone being of subordinate importance. Stress and musical accent may rest on different syllables or may coincide. In early Latin this energetic stress-accent was not bound by the three-syllable limit. A tendency existed to recession from the end of the word. The proofs advanced for this proposition are much the same as those adduced by Corssen, and not more convincing. Whether *stetérunt* or *stétérunt* is to be assumed as the earlier form is left undecided; but *cónitum* evidently goes back to *cónnōtum*, and *éiero* to *éiouro*. The significant syllable received the accent; hence *návifragus* becoming later *náufragus*, *nómencapo* becoming *núncupo*. Analogically, in the Romance languages we find evidence for the accent *víginti*, *tríginta*.

In treating of the established accent of classical Latin, Seelmann recognizes, as Corssen did not, the possibility of particles and pronouns having different accents accompanied by a difference of meaning. In assigning to Latin a circumflex and acute accent essentially like the Greek, he is carried too far by grammatical theories. That the rules laid down by the grammarians were not strictly followed in the popular pronunciation, is proved from the Romance languages and other evidence. Such vulgar deviations in accent are *pariétem*, *muliérem*, *tenébrae*, *trífolium*, *fícatum*, *credímus*. Some interesting observations are made on certain borrowed Greek words which retain their native accent at the cost of quantity. In proper names, too, the evidence of the Romance languages establishes as the common pronunciation *Pátavium*, *Písaurum*, *Mogúntiacum*.

Considerable attention is paid to "recomposition" where the same elements enter in as in older words, but with different accent and with the vowel of the simplex unchanged, as in *désúper* over against *désuper*, *consácro* over against *cónsecro*, *commándo* and *commendo*. The details of this phenomenon must largely be worked out from the Romance.

In treating of vowel-quantity Seelmann recognizes the divisions into longs and shorts to be very inadequate. The position and character of the accent have much to do with the relative quantity, and difference in quantity influences also vowel-coloring, so that long vowels tend to become closer, short vowels more open—a fact which, in the treatment of the ancient tongues, has not received due recognition. Seelmann's description of sounds is excellent, but as his phonetic terminology is largely his own, with peculiar characters having special phonetic values, it is hard adequately to represent his views by any brief statement. Much attention is paid to the determination of hidden quantities from the Romance. Here the student, however, must be on his guard, as Marx and Seelmann and Gröber often disagree. On p. 92, to the evidence for *forma*, should be added Donatus Comment. to Phormio, Prolog. v. 28: "Si a *formula* esset nomen comoediae primam produceremus syllabam."

The chapter on the division of syllables is admirable, giving not only the

facts, but their scientific explanation. Baehrens' complete misconception of consonant-geminates is exposed.

In treating of the vocalism, the pronunciation of the early empire is made the starting-point, the deviations of earlier and later periods being noted. The same is true of the consonantism. Here the materials of Corssen and Schuchardt have been largely drawn upon, with an immense gain in arrangement and scientific statement. Whether the treatment is here truly historical, and whether too much weight has not been accorded to the testimony of late grammarians, admits of discussion. Every page is full of suggestion, and challenges the serious study of all Latinists. Occasional slips, like that of associating *καὶ ἔτεροι* with *ceteri*, p. 167 (corrected by Stolz in the *Nachträge*), might be noticed, but they do not greatly impair the value of the book. Its scientific character has been recognized by Stolz, who, in his recent Latin grammar in the new *Handbuch der klassischen Alterthums-Wissenschaft*, has adopted its description of sounds. We have never before seen Latin phonetically printed, and the specimen passages which are given at the end of the book are as curious and as disturbing to the eye as any of the attempts which have been made to give to English a phonetic dress. The book would have been much improved if the alphabetical index had been made more complete.

M. WARREN.

---

M. Tulli Ciceronis ad M. Brutum Orator. A Revised Text, with Introductory Essays and Critical and Explanatory Notes. By JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, M. A. Cambridge, University Press, 1885.

It seems altogether fitting that the Public Orator at Cambridge should give to his University and the world this sumptuous edition of the Orator, with its MS facsimile, its well-executed illustrations, its copious introductions, and its very solid body of notes, both critical and explanatory. It is a welcome addition to our Cicero-literature.

The introduction traverses the history of Greek and Roman oratory, acquaints us with the motives of the work and Cicero's peculiar fitness for writing it, discusses the Greek sources and the MSS upon which the text is founded, and furnishes us with an excellent bibliography of the various editions, commentaries, dissertations and other works which have a general or particular bearing upon the subject-matter. It is rare to find so good a bibliography compressed into so small a compass. And the notes give evidence that Mr. Sandys has faithfully endeavored to master all that has been done by others, and to contribute of his own knowledge to the elucidation of this most important work. The student of Blass and Jebb will not find much that is new in the sketch of early Greek oratory and rhetoric, but the facts are freshly stated and form a fitting introduction to the treatise. The chapter on MSS is particularly satisfactory, and after the labors of Heerdegen and Stangl it would seem that little now remains to be done in the way of collecting materials on which to base the text. The oldest MS now in the public library at Avranches has been newly examined by Mr. Sandys, and in some cases he has been able to correct Heerdegen's readings. In the commentary much more attention has been paid to explaining Cicero's references to famous works of art than will

be found in any previous edition. The treatment of the text is in the main conservative. In I 3, *quo nihil addi possit* is kept, where Piderit and Jahn read *cui*. The parallels p. Mur. 28, Phil. XI 15, ad Fam. III 13, §2, seem to establish *quo*. One might almost be tempted to regard it as partly due to the influence of such expressions as *quo nihil esse possit praestantius*, although it is easier and more regular to explain it as equal to "whereunto." In X 34, the reading *frueris ipse + te* stands unemended in the text, none of the suggestions of previous editors being accepted. In XII 38, *se* is inserted so as to read *se studiose consecutatum fatetur*, although Cicero's omission of *se* with *fatetur* can no longer be doubted, and is admitted by Sandys in his notes. In XXXVI 92 *liquitur* is emended to *labitur*, with the other editors. Why may it not be used in the sense of *fluit*, as *liquidum* is used in De Oratore II 159, *genus sermonis adfert non liquidum, non fusum ac profuens?* In XIX 65, *apertius*, the reading of MSS is deserted for the better reading *verba altius transferunt*. In view of *tralationi* for *translationi*, it may be questioned whether more weight ought not to be attached to the *traferuntur* of A in XXVII 93. In commenting on XXXIX 135, the common mistake is made of deriving *sursum* directly from *subvorsum*, instead of from *susvorsum*. On §158, the note "In Plautus and Terence *absque* is often found for *abs*" is misleading, as *absque* occurs only twice in Terence, and relatively not more often in Plautus, while its usage is quite different from *abs*. Many of the brief renderings which are given of phrases are very clever, and some excellent notes on etymology and usage have been contributed by Reid and Postgate. The illustrations include a copy of extracts from the Codex Abrincensis, a bust of Cicero from the Royal Museum, Madrid, a bust of Brutus in the Capitoline Museum, coins of Elis with the Olympian Zeus, and a marble fragment of a shield of Athene Parthenos, which, while they greatly add to the attractiveness of the book, must also increase its price, and this is so high as almost to preclude its being used largely in American schools and colleges—a circumstance greatly to be regretted as there is no other available edition with English notes.

M. W.

## REPORTS.

HERMES, 1885.<sup>1</sup>

### No. I.

W. Dittenberger. The Kerykes of Eleusis. This treatise on an interesting topic of Attic antiquities is by one of the editors of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*, which collection, to a very great extent, furnishes the material for the author's statements and arguments. Of the former we may note that there was but *one* *γένος* of *κήρυκες* in Attica. Here, as elsewhere, paternal descent determined membership, and a boy once introduced by his father could not afterwards be received into any other *γένος*. There was an *ἀρχων τοῦ γένος* with one year's term of office; there were, moreover, a treasurer (*ταμίας*) and a priest for the special worship of the *γένος*. Eleusis seems to have been the place of meeting.

This *γένος* regularly furnished three of the religious functionaries who took part in the ceremonies of the Eleusinian mysteries: the torchbearer (*δαδοῦχος*), the herald (*κῆρυξ*), and the "priest at the altar" (*οἱ ἐπὶ βωμῷ*), whereas the "hierophants" belonged to the *γένος* of the Eumolpidae. The office of *daduchos* was for a long time held by the Calliadae of Athens, and when this family became extinct the privilege was certainly maintained within the limits of the same *γένος*. This office of the torchbearer, with that of the priest and of the herald, was held for life. While the *Archon Basileus* of Athens was the chief executive functionary in the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries, the *γένος* of the *κήρυκες* had certain official functions in arranging the celebration. Each and every member of the *γένος* enjoyed the right of initiating (*μνεῖν*) new members into the mysteries—a privilege shared by the Eumolpidae alone.

In the Roman era the political importance of these offices was greatly increased: the *κῆρυξ τῆς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆς* (pp. 35-6), as well as the *κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου*, were exclusively appointed from the *γένος* of the Kerykes. Herodes Atticus was a member of the same.

L. von Sybel. Toxaris. After presenting the views of Lobeck, Welcker, Preller, Hirschfeld (*Hermes*, 1874), and Paucker, Sybel insists that Toxaris, the "foreign physician" (*Dem. XIX* 249), and Alkon are three separate persons. Moreover, Sybel holds that Toxaris, the beneficent Scythian, is an invention of Lucian, for the legend of his saving advice how to check the plague at Athens in 430 B. C. is inconsistent with Thucydides. The name of *Δειμανέτη*, to whom Toxaris is said by Lucian to have appeared on that occasion, has an ironical flavor when reduced to its etymology. As regards the *στύλη* on the outskirts of Athens, which, according to Lucian, exhibited a Scythian holding a bow in

<sup>1</sup> The reporter desires to express his special obligations to the chief librarian and assistant librarians of Columbia College, New York City, for placing the valuable resources of the library at his disposal.—E. G. S.

one hand and a "roll of MS" in the other, Sybel calls attention to a pair of archers found on the same ground and now preserved in the Museum of Athens, and Sybel's suggestion that Lucian used one of these figures to construct his Toxaris legend upon is certainly very plausible.

H. Nohl. *On the Value and Descent of Certain MSS of Cicero's Verrinae IV and V* preserved at Wolfenbüttel. Nohl holds that they are copies from the text of a Paris MS.

Wilamowitz. *Ein altattisches Epigramm.* As such W. interprets the poem Anthol. Palat. XIII 28. On its face it is an epinikion of a chorus of the tribe 'Ακαμαντίς at Athens, and it seems to have been inscribed upon the tripod which became the ἀνάθημα of the victors. The arguments of Wilamowitz are, of course, mainly based upon internal evidence. The general resemblance which the poem bears to the Pindaric type of composition is striking. W. holds the poem to be a dithyramb of the age of the Persian wars, say between 490 and 480.

The metre, indeed, is anomalous. As a work of art the poem is too inferior to be assigned to either Simonides or Bacchylides; but while of small intrinsic value, these verses would seem to be of considerable historical interest.

G. Faltin. *Hannibal's Invasion of Etruria (217 B. C.).* The author discusses the historical tradition in detail, weighing the evidence of Polybius and of Livy, as well as of modern students such as Niebuhr, Nissen (Italische Landeskunde), Neumann and others. The swamps which Hannibal traversed early in 217 B. C. were on the Etruscan side of the Apennine. A detailed report on this paper would be feasible only if a detailed map of the Apennine could be here affixed.

O. Richter, a special student of the topography of Rome, discusses the term *insula*, quoting, amongst other passages, the following from Festus, p. 111: *Insulæ proprie dicuntur quae non iunguntur parietibus cum vicinis circuituque publico aut privato cinguntur, i. e. houses detached from all others by an ambitus*, which the Twelve Tables fixed at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  *pedes*. Later, when single houses ceased to be thus detached, the word *insula* was used for something analogous to an American 'block,' as well as for large tenements. In the age of Constantine Rome contained, within the walls of Aurelian, 1681 *domus* and 44,300 *insulae*. How is *insula* to be taken for this era? The trouble is that no census of the full number of inhabitants of Rome has been handed down. So much, however, may be gathered from special data (e. g. that at the time of Severus some 200,000 persons were entitled to receive *frumentum publicum*) that it would not do to take *insula* simply as 'house.' Richter holds that *insula* was the unit of taxed property in improved real estate, in very many cases a 'story' of large tenement buildings, in other cases an entire large apartment-house, *domus* corresponding to 'mansion.' To some extent this paper, like other papers on kindred subjects by the same author, controverts the positions taken by Jordan.

M. Mayer (Berlin). *On the (last) Protesilaos of Euripides, a Reconstruction.* Protesilaos was the first of the Greeks who fell in the Trojan expedition immediately upon landing, having been married but one day when the fleet

set sail from Aulis. Upon imploring the powers of the lower world, he received permission to return (although but for a very brief time) to his young wife. There is some reference to the legend in Eustathius on Il. II 325, where two statements are given. Further on Mayer quotes Tzetzes, who relates in detail that the widow fashioned a wooden image of Protesilaos :

ξέλινον εἰδωλον ποιεὶ μορφῆς Πρωτεστάλαον  
καὶ συνεκοίταζεν αὐτῇ τῷ πόθῳ τοῦ συζύγου· κτέ.

Tzetzes also relates that, according to the most correct version, she took her own life with the sword. An image of Protesilaos probably figured in the play. Ovid, Heroid. XIII 150 sqq., makes it wax; the *ἀψυχος φίλος* of Fragm. 657 evidently is to be understood as referring to the image. Lucian, Dial. Mort. 23, deals with the same subject. Hyginus' collection presents two versions, according to the latter of which Laodamia (the faithful spouse) flung herself upon the pyre on which the waxen image was being consumed at the behest of her father, Acastos. A conflict probably was worked out in the drama as between the young widow and her father: she refusing to surrender the waxen image, and he insisting that she must do so and, moreover, wed a second husband. Then the appearance of Protesilaos from the lower world, the meeting with Laodamia and with Acastos, were no doubt treated by Euripides with telling effect. A sarcophagus in Naples and one in the Vatican exhibit scenes from the legend. The paper is of substantial value.

Th. Mommsen. Zama. Owing to the French invasion of Tunisia, Roman inscriptions in great abundance have been gathered, being found between 1881 and 1884. Amongst other results, this too is notable—that the location of the two Zamas is now ascertained. They were about 30 Roman miles apart, being situated on the northern slopes of that mountain range which is cut in two by the Siliannah River in its upper course, one being about 60, and the westerly about 100 *milia passuum* from Hadrumetum (Sousah), to which port Hannibal fled after the disastrous end of the famous battle 202 B. C. Mommsen argues that the westerly Zama was the scene of the battle.

A. Kirchhoff publishes a very ancient inscription of Thessaly (not much later, according to the character of the letters, than 500 B. C.), which he edits as follows : Μνᾶμ' ἐμὶ Πνυρ(ρ)ιά | δα, δς οὐκ ἡπ(ι) | στατο φείγειν (φείγειν on the ins.) ἀλ(λ)' αἰθε περ γάς | τᾶσδε πολ(λ)ὸν ἀ | ριστεύων έθανε—an evident attempt to construct an elegiac distich, in which the pentameter, however, goes to pieces. *αἰθε* is a problem.

#### No. II.

A. Kopp (on the Homeric Lexicon of Apion) discusses the sources of certain glosses contained in the Homer MSS Baroccianus of Oxford, and a Darmstadt MS. The principle of Apion's lexicon (discernible even now, in spite of the late shape in which the remnants appear, and the woful condition of the present collection) seems to have been to give every sense of those words which have more than one meaning. Exceptions are probably due to later compilers. Many articles in the Homeric lexicon of Apollonius Sophista are due to Apion, in defense of which view Kopp argues against Lehrs.

H. Kühlewein. Critical Notes on the Text of Hippocrates' Treatise on Wounds in the Head, often criticising Littré's edition.

R. Thommen. On the Time at which Polybius composed his History (pp. 196-236). Th. calls attention to the fact that Polybius, at the outset, marked the downfall of the Macedonian dynasty, 168 B. C., as the limit of his work; later, however, he undertook the adding of subsequent events down to 145 B. C.—events of which he was not only a spectator, but in which he to a certain extent shared as an actor (III 4, 13). Books I-II were composed as one work. These books were composed while Polybius was still, officially, a prisoner of state, although at liberty to move about freely in Italy, visiting Locri, *e. g.* before 156 B. C., likewise the Po-country, etc.

Next, as to Books III-VI. In VI, capp. 52, 56, etc., Polybius, in comparing the character and practice of Rome and Carthage, uses the present tense in a way that would be inconsistent with the destruction of Carthage; evidently these books were written before 146. Both in VI 1, 1-3 and in III 1, 8 he maintains the period of 53 years as the compass of his task.

Passages which suggest later composition, Thommen (pp. 210 sqq.) explains as later additions by Polybius. In the company of Scipio Aemilianus, Polybius made a journey across the Alps to Spain, and into Africa, where he met and conversed with old Massinissa.<sup>1</sup> Books VII-VIII afford no clues for chronological determination. In IX 9, 9 Polybius still speaks of Carthage as a political power in the present tense. XII 25, 3 implies the actual existence of Carthage; other *indicia* point to the conclusion that this book was written between 155-152. XIV 10, 5 is interpreted in a similar manner. The chronological explanation of the reference to the splendor of Jerusalem, XVI 39, 4-5, Thommen leaves an open question. But, to sum up, Th. argues that Books I-XXX contained the carrying out of his great original project, viz. to bring his work down to 168 B. C.

After an interval of 15 years or so he added the rest. The episode on his personal relations to Scipio Aemilianus in XXXII was probably written before<sup>2</sup> the death of Scipio, 129 B. C., and after 132. Many portions of this, as well as of other portions of these later books, were jotted down immediately after the events, and were bodily edited in the old age of the author. On the whole, chronological clues in the second portion of the work are rarer.

Jul. Beloch (On the National Wealth of Attica) attempts to overthrow the accepted views on population, grain-production, wealth, as laid down by Boeckh in the *Staatshaushaltung*; the grain-production, which Boeckh put at 2,800,000 medimni, Beloch reduces to 700,000. Much of the argument of Beloch turns on the subject of *εισφορά*, which for the era of Demosthenes Boeckh takes as meaning not only the property-tax itself, but also the *rate* of assessment. This interpretation Beloch rejects, but goes still further, viz. he discredits the data presented by Demosthenes, contra Aphobum I, as to the patrimony of Demosthenes, claiming, *e. g.* that the slaves who were cutlers were not worth five to six minae (cf. Aphob. 9) each, but only two minae. Demosthenes, he claims, exaggerated his fortune threefold or more, and all computations based thereon must fall to the ground according to Beloch.

<sup>1</sup> Thommen's attempt to prove that Polybius made other tours across the Alps before this one seems to rest on very slender foundations indeed.—E. G. S.

<sup>2</sup> But how is XXXII 9, 1 to be explained: θάττον ἡ καθῆκεν ἐξέλαμψεν ἡ τοῦ Σκυπίωνος ἀντὶ Πάμη δόξα?—E. G. S.

While the arguments of Beloch impress the reader in the main as defective,<sup>1</sup> it will be well if his speculations stir up classical students to renewed study of the data and topics involved.

W. Soltau. On the Manipular System of Roman Tactics. H. Delbrück (Hist. Zeitschrift, Neue Folge, XV 239) had seriously questioned whether the accepted view of the arrangement of the *manipuli*, and subsequently of the cohorts, in battle—the famous system of intervals producing the *quincunx*—was really correct, but he seems to have overlooked the manoeuvre of *laxare ordines*, by which, in the moment of going into action, the actual front was easily doubled; which point, too, is referred to by Polybius in his description of the battle of Kynoskephalai, 197 B. C., in which the Roman *manipuli* were confronted with the Macedonian phalanx. Polybius says that while standing in battle array, the Romans, just like the phalanx of Macedon, occupied three feet per man, but double the space in action: *προφανές, ὅτι χάλασμα καὶ διάστασιν ἀλλήλων ἔχειν δεῖσι τὸν ἀνδρας ἐλάχιστον τρεῖς πόδας κατ' ἐπιστάτην καὶ κατὰ παραστάτην, εἰ μέλλοντιν εὐχρηστεῖν πρὸς τὸ δέον.* 'Εκ δὲ τόντον συμβίσσεται τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ οὐτασθαι κατὰ δύο πρωτοστάτας τῶν φαλαγγιτῶν, κτέ.'

Th. Mommsen. Oropos and the Roman Tax-Farmers. In 86 B. C. Sulla defeated the generals of Mithridates at Chaeronea. About this time he made a vow to Amphiaraos giving immunity from Roman taxation to the citizens of Oropos, and decreeing that all revenues and imposts of that port should be set aside for the sanctuary of Amphiaraos there. Now, the *publicani*, in course of time, insisted on collecting taxes from Oropos, and pointed to the clause in their contract with the State which exempted lands and other property consecrated to the "immortal gods," claiming that Amphiaraos was nothing of the kind. Three delegates from Oropos, together with representatives of the *publicani*, in 73 B. C., appeared before a sub-committee of 15 senators, of whom M. Tullius Cicero was one, arguing the case. This committee decided against the *publicani*, and upheld the decree of Sulla and the resultant claim of the Oropians. All of this is set forth in an inscription found on a marble slab near the ancient site of the sanctuary of Amphiaraos near Oropus, found by the Archaeological Society of Athens, in course of recent excavations, and first published in the 'Εφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική, 1884, p. 98 sqq. The Greek text is palpably a slavish translation of the Latin document received from Rome.

Th. Kock. Emendationes Aeschyleae.

E. G. SIHLER.

INTERNATIONALE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ALLGEMEINE SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT, VON F. TECHMER. II Band, 1 Hälfte. Leipzig, 1885.

The new journal, now in its second year, goes on to justify its name by being fairly international. The Germans, indeed, predominate; but alongside of articles from Leipzig and Halle, come others from London and St. Petersburg

<sup>1</sup> One of the chief arguments of Beloch's paper turns on the correct interpretation of c. Aphob, 7: "τὸ δὲ πλῆθος τῆς οὐσίας ὅτι τοῦτ' ἦν τὸ καταλευφθέν κτέ," where *ὅσον* must be taken as referring to the *rate* of taxes paid (so per cent.) on the assessment, and where, most assuredly, the context implies that the lower assessments involved a *lower rate*. Boeckh's view of *εἰσφορά* for the present should be maintained.—E. G. S.

and Washington; and two of the essays are in English. In all the points that make the attractive book, Techmer's *Zeitschrift* is beautiful to see, pleasant to handle, and easy to read. In contents also, especially to students of anthropology and of language on its psychological and scientific sides, the journal offers many attractions. And even for students of narrower range, for specialists in Latin, Greek, English, etc., there is a good amount of new knowledge and of useful facts and theories. It is, indeed, the manifest aim of Dr. Techmer to bring the most modern achievements of linguistic science into relation with the practical processes of teaching. In his philology there is a strong bent toward pedagogy.

In the new number, the article that has the deepest and most permanent interest is one of 20 pages, by Dr. F. Kluge, of Jena, on the History of Sign-Language. In this he edits with admirable precision an Anglo-Saxon treatise, never published before, on the Sign-Language of the Anglo-Saxon Monasteries. The text, with translation and notes, fills 13 pages. In respect both of the language itself, which is very careful and precise in grammatical forms, and very rich in vocabulary, and also of the customs and manners revealed, this treatise is of lively interest and great value.

Next to this in value comes a long essay, of 71 pages, by Dr. A. F. Pott, of Halle, the beginning of a great work to be called an Introduction to the General Science of Language. This beginning is devoted to the literature and bibliography of the less familiar departments of the science. It brings together into one body of classified authorities, carefully criticised, the chief works, down to the most modern, that bear on the languages of Asia. Under each head the author gives an interesting, and sometimes elaborate, discussion of the linguistic position and relation of the language or dialect in question. The essay represents the outcome of an enormous learning. Of especial interest are his remarks on the language of Japan, pp. 74 *seq.*, of the Caucasus, pp. 99 *seq.*, and of the Gypsies, pp. 111 *seq.* Under this last head, Dr. Pott, going back to his own brilliant study of the Gypsy language, published 1844-5, gathers together the facts accumulated during forty years to give support to the theory of Gypsy origin that may now be accepted as final.

In addition to these two great articles, there are five others that from one or other aspect of philology are worth study. Dr. G. Ebers gives, in 31 pages, a bright and learned sketch of Richard Lepsius as student of languages. Prof. Herbert Baynes, writing in English, gives, in 12 pages, a suggestive essay "On the Psychological Side of Language." Dr. Karl Abel, in an essay that promises much for the future, opens up, in 12 pages, some novel views on "The Question of the Relationship of Languages." Dr. W. Radloff, of St. Petersburg, in a paper of 29 pages, continues his account of the language of the Komanes. This, although very clearly arranged and full of curious facts, can have interest for very few students. But the essay by the editor, Dr. Techmer, "On the Development, Formation and Acquisition of Language," will interest all that are either students or teachers. For those especially that have to teach the mother tongue or any one of the great modern languages, the clear reasoning, excellent method and definite results of this essay are very valuable.

First, in respect of the philosophy of language, the essay of Baynes is

founded upon the study of the ways in which reason and speech, as interdependent powers, act and react upon each other. There is, he says, p. 3 *seq.*, in the development of the human being a fourfold succession of phenomena: 1st, feeling; 2d, sensation; 3d, perception; 4th, apperception. Of these, feeling and sensation result respectively in cries and interjections. Perception now comes into play, and out of these cries and interjections produces, by means of onomatopoeia, a new class of sounds, which deserve to be called words. Finally, apperception, which is the grouping of perceptions into concepts, gives the possibility of connected discourse "in an endless progress of linguistic structure and variety." The reasoning is subtle, but it is clearly stated and well exemplified. The theory itself, if accepted, has the merit of making atonement between two sharply conflicting theories. Strangely enough, Dr. Techmer, in his essay, p. 145 *seq.*, approaches the same problem, trying another line of solution. But, although he starts from a different point, he too works out a fourfold succession in the development of speech: 1st, the period of natural cries and significant gestures; 2d, the period of pointing (demonstrative roots); 3d, the period of imitation (onomatopoeia); 4th, the period of metaphor, symbolism and abstraction. The two schemes have, it is plain, much in common, and they explain much. In each the 4th stage has the highest interest. Here, too, in explaining the formation of concepts, Baynes comes to a threefold statement of the process. Where Techmer has metaphor, symbolism and abstraction, Baynes has synonymy, homonymy and antonymy. This does not seem so adequate as Techmer's division; but it serves to introduce a beautiful discussion of some difficult and neglected parts of philology. The power of antonymy—*e. g.*, *bad* and *better* in English—to form words and develop roots, has never, we think, been enough regarded. In connection with this subject, the quotations made by Techmer from Wundt's Logic, p. 147 *seq.*, show how firmly that great master of modern psychology has grasped the problem of human speech. Dr. Pott, on p. 92, brings forward a marvellous fact to unsettle accepted notions on the rapid growth and divergence of dialects. After so many centuries of separation, the Turks from Constantinople and the Siberian Turks from Tomsk and Jenisseisk are still able, by speaking slowly, to understand each other. On p. 55 of the same essay Dr. Pott gives a document of great scientific value in the classification of languages. It is the list prepared by Wiedemann of the languages spoken (1881) in the Russian Empire—a list arranged both according to morphological types and according to ethnographical groups. In respect of the study of barbaric languages and dialects—a study that now absorbs so much of the most adventurous intellect of philology—Dr. Ebers gives a picture of Lepsius' method which may serve both as warning and as encouragement. Lepsius checked and controlled his vast historical study of language in general and by family by means of the most minute study of language in particular. "In his great Introduction he boldly sketched the outline of a vast linguistic history that had run on for four or five thousand years, and embraced all the countries of Africa and the adjacent coast-lands of Asia; but in his Nubian Grammar he showed how to use the linguistic microscope and lay bare the nice phonetic shades of dialectic usage"; cf. pp. xix-xx. In the philosophy of language, however, it is the application, use or abuse, of the Darwinian theory of evolution that must most

excite the minds of contemporary thinkers. On this the views of Dr. Pott and the views of Dr. Abel, both presented with vigor and clearness, standing by accident opposed to each other in these pages, give to this volume of Techmer a singular interest. The older scholar attacks with vehement energy the theory that in the evolution of human speech there has been any steady development of the lower type into the higher (p. 66 *seq.*). There was, he maintains, no evolution of Indo-Germanic languages from Semitic or Turanian, no evolution of Semitic from Turanian. He sums up, on p. 103, with weighty words: "According to our present knowledge, we are fully justified in denying boldly the genealogical, nay more, the physiological unity of this trio of families, not to speak of others." Yet, with the generosity of boundless resources, even while he attacks and denies the evolution of language according to the scheme of the Darwinians, he gives, p. 79, to the attacked philosophy the knowledge and use of a new fact: "The people of Thibet derives, by tradition, its origin from a pair of apes—a piece of news that Darwinians ought not to let escape them. The race, however, speaks a human language." Against this statement of the absolute difference between Aryan and Semitic languages comes the essay of Dr. Abel. It is, in fact, a preparation of the public mind for the important book that he is now publishing.<sup>1</sup> He starts from a discussion of W. von Humboldt's famous *dictum* that resemblance in inflection is a better means of establishing kinship among languages than the common possession of significant roots. This is, indeed, true of languages that separated after the period of inflection had set in. But it cannot apply to languages that separated from each other before the parent language had developed its system of inflections. Here the resemblance of significant roots would be, it is plain, the only means of proving community of origin. This now is assumed by Abel to be the relation between Indo-European and Semitic languages. And, in his view, the old Egyptian, as now revealed, is "the bridge between the Indo-European and the Semitic groups." By a study of the established roots of the old Egyptian, we can, he thinks, trace those roots downward, independent of inflection, both into the Indo-European and into the Semitic tongues. In announcing his Dictionary of Roots, he promises to show that "at some remote period the formation of roots and stems went on by a common law in the three great branches of the Caucasian race, Egyptian, Aryan and Semitic." The essay is written with all the subtle charm and delightful suggestiveness of Dr. Abel's philological method. It raises the hope of seeing this great problem of science at last solved.

Secondly, in respect of the science of language-teaching, the long essay of Dr. Techmer, pp. 114-92, contains a great body of useful facts and thoughtful suggestions. In America, especially, where the reform and extension of modern-language teaching are now so warmly discussed, this essay should be studied by many. The question of the age at which the learning of the modern languages ought to begin comes in for elaborate discussion. Apart from exceptional cases, the editor thinks the age of eleven to be the right time for beginning, if (and the condition is all-important) the child have by this time a good mastery of words and constructions in his mother tongue. The method

<sup>1</sup> *Einleitung in ein ägyptisch-semitisch-indoeuropäisches Wurzelwörterbuch.* Leipzig, Fried-  
richs, 1886.

of instruction in the foreign language is then given with great detail and in admirable sequence. The editor's advice as to the use to make of practical phonetics in language-teaching is practical and wise. As to the scope of such teaching, he quotes the resolution adopted by the Convention of German Philologists and Schoolmasters at Dessau in 1885: "In French, as in English, in the elementary instruction, the reading of text ought to be the beginning and the aim, and the grammar ought to be taught only in subordination to that end by the inductive method" (p. 143). For the German child, the right beginning of foreign-language study is, Dr. Techmer urges, by all means the English. The arguments by which the claim of the English over the French is made good are ingenious and convincing. Finally, as to the teaching of the mother tongue itself, the editor exposes ably the radical blunder of Jacob Grimm, who, as is known, denied that the study of grammar should have any part in the study of the mother tongue by children. Against Grimm's fanciful conception of a method that should exclude grammar, he sets the able and profound words of Dr. von Raumer in favor of the right kind and amount of grammatical teaching. And even from Grimm himself he quotes later expressions of opinion that reduce his famous paradox almost to right reason.

In Latin, Dr. Pott shows examples—*e. g.*, *pad* and *duc*, p. 72—of roots that have the double function of noun and verb; and he points out the derivation of *pandere* and *passus* from *pad* (to go). He uses Latin examples also to illustrate the principle of phonetic symbolism; as compared with verbs that denote the passive state or condition, those verbs that denote the active bringing about of that condition—*i. e.*, causatives—are fitly characterized by a greater energy of consonants or by a heavier weight of vowels—*e. g.*, *sēdare*, *sōpīo*.

In Greek, Dr. Pott brings back from his review of the Asiatic languages many definite etymologies of borrowed words. *Βαβυλῶν* has nothing to do with "confusion of tongues": it is the *Babili* of the cuneiform inscriptions, "the gate of the god of the river," p. 57. *δάχνως*, used by the author of the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* to mean south, is the modern *Dekhan*: and the form of the word shows that by this time the Sanskrit form had passed into Prakrit. *Ταῶς* is the Tamil word *tōgei*. *σάνταλον* is the Sanskrit *chandana*, a tree from the Malabar region.

In English, finally, the essays contain a good number of interesting facts. *Japan* is the Chinese *si-pen* (sun-rise), a parallel to *Levant* and *Natolia*. Pott, p. 75. *Chemistry* is from the Koptic *chame* (black), the art of the dark-skinned Egyptians, *ib.* p. 82. *Shaster*, the Gypsy word for Bible, is the Sanskrit *gastra*; and *devel*, the Gypsy word for God, is the Skt. *deva*, p. 114. *Ophir* is probably the Skt. *Suvīva*, a land and nation in western India. *Tartar* is the Chinese *Tata*, and owes its r's to the punning of St. Louis with *Tartarus*, p. 84. *Turanian* and *Turan* are probably from the Afghan word *tūr* (black), p. 90. *Aryan*, traced back through its vast ramifications, seems to be the Skt. *aryā* (faithful). *Hindū* and *Hindoo*, as names of India, come from the Skt. *sindhu* (river), the native name of the *Indus*, p. 109. *Better*, through Gothic *batisa*, is traced back to a supposed Gothic verb *batan* (to be useful), cognate with Skt. *bhad-ra* (joyous), from root *bhand* (to shout), p. 104.

The syntactical relation between *than* and *then* is well developed by Pott on p. 68. The difference in nature and function between English and Chinese

monosyllables—a point on which much confusion exists—is clearly expounded on p. 59. Finally, on p. 75, Dr. Pott traces out the curious historical parallel between the Japanese and the English as "mixed languages." The learned Chinese is there to the inherited Japanese as here the Latin to the Anglo-Saxon. The borrowed element is in both cases defined and controlled in grammar by the native.

THOS. R. PRICE.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. Zweiter Jahrgang.

Heft 4.

This number opens with an article on *Per*, pp. 497–508, by Friedrich Stolz, which is intended to enlighten classical philologists, and to rid them of serious errors of conception in regard to the origin of this preposition. The oft-asserted identity of *per* with *παρά* must be given up. *παρά* represents an Indo-Germanic instrumental *pr̄a*, while *per* represents a locative *peri* which before a vowel had lost its *i* and then become generalized. The accusative form of *per* is seen in *perendie* for *\*peremdie*. The real representative of the Greek *παρά* in Latin is *por-*, seen in *polliceo*, *portendo*, etc., while *prae* represents an Indo-Germanic dat. sing. *pr̄ai*. The original signification of *per*, from which the other meanings have been developed, was that of "räumliche Durchdringung." Compounds of *per* are then classified under the following heads: (1) where *per* = *rings um, rings umher, der Reihe nach*; (2) = *durch, hindurch, zer-*; (3) = *darüber hinaus*; (4) where it expresses "die Vollendung oder einen hohen Grad der betreffenden Handlung oder des Zustandes, ferner die lange Dauer der- oder desselben." All the prepositional uses are easily derived from the first two of these meanings, but these uses are not considered in detail by Stolz. The postpositional *per*, seen in *topper, nuper, parumper*, etc., he compares with the Oscan *-pert*, following Mommsen.

Bücheler, p. 508, adduces new evidence from Photios, Lex. 592, for the obscene meaning attaching to *titus*, already discussed in Archiv II, p. 120, and shows that in the Sardinian *tidu*, *tidone*, *tudone*, there are still traces of the word *titus* in the sense of dove.

Thielmann, pp. 509–549, brings to a conclusion his article on "Habere mit dem Part. Perf. Pass." He emphasizes the point that the necessity of distinguishing between the logical or present perfect and the aorist perfect may have contributed to the use of *cognitum habeo* for the former. In recommending one person to another a regular formula is *commendatum habeo*. In Gaul *receptum* is substituted for *commendatum*. Other imperative forms are *dictum habeo*, *praeceptum habeo*, *promissum habeo*, *pactum habeo*. To confirm the close connection between the forms *mihi cognitum est* and *habeo cognitum*, he points to the fact that in most of the expressions where in Plautus the so-called Greek dative is used with a perfect participle, a parallel use with *habeo* is developed later, e. g. with *emptum*, *acceptum*, *spectatum*, *exquisitum*. In Cicero especially *habeo* is thus found combined with verbs which express an activity of the mind, particularly in the philosophical works. Thus we have Acad.

2, 2, in animo res insculptas habebat. Tusc. I, 57, *insitas et quasi consignatas habere in animis*. Cicero sometimes combines several synonyms, as De Fin. II 6, *habere bene cognitam voluptatem et satis firme conceptam animo atque comprehensam*. In this he is followed by Arnobius, who has the simple *cognitum habeo* but once. It is remarkable that *cognitum habeo*, so frequent in Cicero, does not occur in the letters of his correspondents, nor in Caesar, Sallust and Livy, who only use the passive form *est mihi cognitum*. Cicero usually has the order *habeo cognitum*, in which he is followed by Arnobius and Lactantius. In only two cases has he *cognitum habeo*, which, however, became the more usual order. The passive *aliquid cognitum habetur* does not occur until the sixth century. *Incognitum habeo* is first used by Suetonius, and its passive is found in Gallic Latin from the sixth century on. *Notum habui* is used by Valerius Maximus as a perfect to present *novi*, and this usage is noted by Diomedes and Charisius. *Ignotum habeo* is very rare. *Compertum habeo* was a great favorite with historical writers, occurring most frequently in Livy, but used also by orators. *Exploratum habeo* was used but for a short time. *Certum habeo*, used chiefly in the first person singular, and at first confined to the epistolary style, afterwards extended its use. *Persuasum habeo* is not used by Cicero, but found in Caesar and later writers. *Comprehensum habere* is philosophical and not at all colloquial, chiefly occurring in Cicero and his imitators. To sum up, historically, the occurrence of this usage in the comic poets proves it to be of the people. Terence is more limited in its use. It occurs in military expressions and in law Latin. Caesar uses *effectum habere*, the jurists *factum habere*. The usage is at its height in Caesar and Cicero; already, in the second century, it is found principally in the jurists. Few new examples are found in the African Latinity or elsewhere in writers of the third, fourth and fifth centuries. But in the sixth century the scene changes, and in Gregory of Tours we have a great many examples, affecting nearly every verb and not confined to fixed formulas. The early confusion of tenses in the Gallic Latin probably led to the revival and extension of the usage. In Italy and Spain the vulgar formation of the perfect with *habeo* followed somewhat later.

Karl Sittl (pp. 550-80): *Zur Beurtheilung des sog. Mittellateins*. After a brief examination of the causes which led to the decadence of Latin, affecting its study in the schools and its correct use by the people, the special conditions existing in Spain, France and Italy are touched upon, and an attempt is made to fix a date when Middle Latin may be said to begin. Except for Spain, this may be put about the middle of the sixth century. When we remember that before this time final *m* was silent, final *i* had sunk to *e*, final *u* to *o*; that the sharp distinction between long and short vowels was lost, and *ae* written not simply for *ē*, but for *ē*, the decay of the Latin declension cannot excite wonder. In the first declension there were properly but two cases: nom., voc., acc., abl. in *a*; gen., dat. in *e*. In the second declension the dat., acc., abl. ended in *o*, the gen. in *i*, with great irregularities in spelling. In the third declension all the oblique cases virtually ended in *e*, although for the gen. the spellings *is*, *i*, *es*, *e*, *em*, *ae* are found, and similar confusion prevailed in the other cases. The fourth declension was merged in the second, and the fifth in the third. In the nom. s. of Declension II a difference of treatment arose. In Italy, Spain and Switzerland final *s* was mostly dropped. In France it was more

often retained. The people, moreover, said *aprus*, not *aper*. In Decl. III, except in France, *es* and *e* were identical, and new nominatives were formed after the analogy of the oblique cases, as *cucumer*, *vomer*, *merces* for *merx*; *pontes* for *pons*; *antistites*, *principes*, etc. The nom. was even written *facultatem*, *principem*, the *m*, of course, being silent. In neuters we find new nominatives like *carcere*, *animale*, *sale*, *melle*, although neuters in *us* sometimes go over to the II Decl. In the plural the following endings occur:

I Decl. Nom. *e* (=*ae*); acc. *as*; dat., abl. *is*, *es*, *iz*.

II Decl. Nom. *i*, acc. *os*, more frequently written *us*; dat., abl. *is*, *es*, *aes*, *ies*. Neuters: nom., acc. *a*.

III Decl. Nom., acc. *es*, *is*, *ies*. With this is merged the V Decl., as the IV with the II Decl.

In the gen. pl. the III, IV and V Declensions followed the analogy of the I and II. Thus we find from *mensis*, *misoro*, *mesoro*, *mesorum*, *μησωπονη*, *mesoru* and *misoru*. These, however, do not occur in France. A few examples are given of datives irregularly formed, as *amicibus*, *avibus*, *natibus*, *colonibus*, but the lengthy ending in *ibus* was for the most part avoided.

As a consequence of this blurring of case-endings, the feeling for proper syntax is lost. The accusative is used for the abl. absolute, as in late Latin the abl. was rarely used without a preposition. Hence *se vivum*, *impleta tempora*, *rebelles caeos*, etc. The acc. is used for the nom. In an inscription of 341 occurs (*h*)*onore oblatum est*, pronounced *onore oblatu est*.

In Italy the loss of final *s* in plural cases led also to the following results: 1. In Declensions I and II the nom. takes the place of acc. 2. In Declension III, for distinction from the singular, the *i* of the second declension is adopted. Hence *ad omni* = *ad omnes*. In France, on the contrary, the *s* was retained. This difference may often serve to fix the locality of certain documents.

The details in regard to the neuter plural forms, and the fate in a later period of the singular forms above described, cannot here be given. In closing, the writer calls attention to new growths which accompanied the decay, especially to the use of *de* and *ad* to express case-relation. In this abstract we have necessarily omitted the numerous examples with the exact references.

Wölfflin, pp. 581-97, gives a full account of the usage of *instar* in different periods, and offers an ingenious explanation of its origin. From glosses and from the literary use, the first meaning of *instar* is shown to have reference to size, with an implication of equivalence to something else; the idea of similitude is a development from this, and not established before Vergil. *Ad instar*, which does not occur before the second century, is due to the efforts of African writers to give *instar* a legitimate construction like *ad exemplum*. Later on *iuxta* and *secundum* are made to govern *instar*. Ovid uses *pondus et instar*, Columella *instar pondo*. Wölfflin, accordingly, comparing a Swiss-German expression, "die Stimmien stehen in (ein)" = "die beiden Wagschalen halten sich das Gleichgewicht," and noticing that *σταρη* and *statera* are used for balance, assumes that *instar* is an old inf. = *instare* with loss of final *e*, accompanied by a shortening of *ar*. One may also assume *poculum est in stare librae* = "der Becher ist so schwer, das er die Andere mit einem Pfunde belegte Wagschale zum stehen bringt." This removes most of the difficulties, and explains at once why *instar* was indeclinable.

Goetz, p. 597, withdraws his emendation of two passages in Apuleius, given in the previous number, p. 341, and which we characterized as venturesome, being reminded by Dr. Gunderman of ἀφάνναι, ἐν ἀφάνναις, and the gloss of Suidas, σκινδαφός : ἀφάνναι, and apinae : φάνναις. The gloss he now would explain in this way:

*aefamiae* : [apinae]  
*aestimiae* : ] *pro aestimationibus*.

He queries also whether it may not be identical with Ital. *affanno*, Diez, I, 8. The St. Gall gloss, *aefunne* we still think represents a Greek word.

Another specimen of the *thesaurus* prepared by Hauler includes the words *abdicabilis*, *abdicatio*, *abdicativus* and *abdicatrix*.

Zingerle, p. 604, points out the archaic *donicum* used by Hilarius, Prol. Psalm. 2, Mign., p. 234, 4; also *episcopium*, Hilar., Prol. Psalm. I, Mign., p. 233, 15.

The *Miscellen*, pp. 605-16, which are particularly interesting in this number, include short articles by Bücheler, Stowasser, Vogel, Sittl, Havet, and a list of additions and corrections to previous numbers prepared by the editor.

Pp. 617-30 are occupied by reviews.

M. W.

FLECKEISEN'S JAHRBÜCHER FÜR CLASSISCHE PHILOLOGIE. 1883.<sup>1</sup>

Fascicle 7.

66. A review of Schneidewin's *Agamemnon*, second edition, revised by Otto Hense; review by Wecklein. Hense is commended for abandoning that radical treatment to which he subjected his revision of Nauck's *Trachiniai*. H. has left Schneidewin's own work on the *Agamemnon* uncorrected, as far as possible, though a decided toning down of S.'s exaggerated discoveries of the height and depth of the poet's meaning is apparent. This moderation, however, has led to an unevenness and an occasional inconsistency. One must regret the strong influence which Ahrens' work (first supp. vol. *Philologus*) has had on Hense. A full account is presented of all those portions of this edition where the impression of inaccuracy or faulty judgment is given. The review is not favorable.

67. Zu Aischylos. Three short articles, the first by Lugebil, supplementary to Nauck, on the interchange of *πολὺς* and *μέγας* in Aisch. Application of these remarks is made to the *Seven against Thebes*, 489, and the question is raised whether we are to read *πολλῆν* or *μεγάλῃν*. The next is by Mähly, on the first chorus of the *Hiketides*; the third, by A. Hildebrandt, in reply to Lugebil (Jgbr., 1882, p. 727), on the interpretation of lines 380 and 381 in the *Seven*. In the ninth *Yasna* chapter of the *Avesta*, Haoma tells Zarathustra, who was the first man to press the Haoma: "Kerasaspa was a noble youth who slew the horned dragon, the devourer of horses and men, poisonous and green. Over him Kerasaspa cooked his meal at midday; then was it hot for the dragon; he issued forth and upset the boiling water." If he also howled, we get some light possibly upon the *μεσημβριναὶ κλαγγαὶ* of the dragon in Aischylos.

<sup>1</sup> See A. J. P. VI, p. 504; also VI, p. 234.

68. *δ, δπερ, ἄ*, in the sense of 'wherefore,' 'while,' 'although.' The article is by R. Schneider, and covers ten pages. The conclusion drawn is: The acc. of specification in pronouns, where it serves to connect with what goes before, in the sense of 'with ref. to which,' 'wherefore,' 'since indeed,' 'although,' or 'while,' begins with Homer, runs down into late Greek, in writers of prose and poetry, but is at no time common. This warns us to be careful in emending such uses of these pronouns.

69. On the hypothesis of Aristophanes' Wasps. K. Zacher, Breslau. Critical notes.

70. Zu Ciceros Briefen. Critical note on Epis. XV 4, by B. Hirschwald, Breslau.

71. Pausanias und seine ankläger. J. Schubart, Kassel. A sharp and decidedly unfavorable review of G. Hirschfeld's article in the Archaeol. Zeitung, XL 97 ff., 'Pausanias und die inschriften von Olympia.' Hirschfeld may have shown quite clearly that Pausanias' list of athletes does not reach beyond the second century B. C., and may have compared all that has been found and bears upon the list of athletes with great care. But that Pausanias described not the Olympia of his time, but of 200 B. C., is a thesis, as S. firmly maintains, which Hirschfeld has not yet proved.

72. Baedeker's Griechenland (1883). Favorably reviewed by L. Schwabe, Tübingen.

73. Zu Ciceros Rede pro Milone. Textual criticisms by A. Uttenkamp and Rohde.

(9.) Zu Florus. Three emendations proposed by Eussner, Würzburg.

84. *Animum inducere* in old Latin. A. Funck. The meanings of this expression are reduced to two categories: First, where the meaning is 'to convince one's self'; secondly, where the meaning is 'to decide.' These two meanings, which can easily fall together, came from one origin. *Animum inducere* with *ut*, or with the infinitive, often conformed with *aliquem inducere*. Madvig, however, in discussing Livy's use of this expression, shows where it did not conform.

(49.) Wisibada. S. Widmann, Wiesbaden. A discussion of Cuno's derivation of this name (see Jgbr., 1883, p. 302).

75. Horazischer realismus. Th. Plüss, Basel. The Horatian realism touched upon here is to be found in the aging Lydia and the 25th of the first book of Odes. Sarcasm as a motive in Horace is not so common as we would have it; frequently, where it does become the motive, there is no intention to hurt or to be personal. Nay, his sarcasm may arouse some entirely opposite feeling, like pity. Horatian realism may, after all, be ideal both in purpose and in effect. The sharp and hard lines of a hard and sharp actuality are intended to reproduce an aesthetic effect on the spectator, who recognizes in the picture the clear image of what he had often felt, though perhaps obscurely. There is no crass realism in Carm. II 20.

76. Zum libellus de Constantino Magno. Hydenreich, Freiberg. A new edition of this work is necessary, in which many improvements in the text as we have it may find place, by collating the new manuscript C.

## Fascicle 8.

77. *Prolegomena ad papyrorum graecorum novam collectionem edendam.* C. Wessely, reviewed by Landwehr, Berlin. An analysis of W.'s work is given, but Landwehr confines his review to the disquisitiones palaeographicae and diplomaticae, and the interpretatio instrumenti I and II. The review is not favorable; it fails, however, to expose any positive errors in Wessely's work. The larger work, to which these prolegomena were to serve as a preface, not yet having appeared, it was impossible that the reviewer, in aught he had to say, should feel assured that he hit just those features of the treatise which deserved either censure or praise.

78. *Zu Hieronymus de viris illustribus.* Textual notes on three passages, by W. Gemoll, Striegau.

79. *Zur geschichte des zweiten athenischen bundes.* Höck, Husum. This was the federation of B. C. 378. Busolt had concluded as to its terms that, in deliberations on war, peace, and treaties with other States, the members of it had only an advisory power with reference to the Athenians. The demus might, therefore, reject a dogma of the council of the confederation for a treaty to be concluded with a foreign State, which would then have a binding force on the members of it, without even the Athenians taking the trouble to inform them. This view Höck opposed in the Jahrb., 1878, 473 ff. In the present article he argues from the formulas of the oaths as found in C. I. A. II 1; add. n. 49b. In Hermes XIV 119 ff. he argued from the terms of the peace of Philokrates, holding that the Athenians, in consultations on war, peace, and alliances, were guided by the proposals of the majority of the confederation; or if they rejected or changed them, such action was to be ratified by it before its members could be compelled to conform. Lenz now understands that the *δόγματα συμμάχων* did not have so great importance in treaties of alliance as in war and peace. Höck's present article aims to combat this and to answer Busolt.

80. *Zur schlacht bei Marathon.* Sohr, Wiesbaden. An explanation of Nepos's description: "Namque arbores multis locis erant rarae."

81. *Homerisches.* C. Nauck. Note on *εἰκοσινήριτος* and on *ἔξετε ἀδμήτην*, Il. Ψ 266 and 655.

82. *Zur landeskunde und geschichte Kilikiens.* Neumann. 25 pages devoted, first, to the western limit of Kilikia; secondly, to the pass between Kilikia and Syria. K. Müller is our only authority on the divisions of Asia Minor. This paper would supplement his work on Kilikia by a quotation from Strabo that Artemidoros made Kilikia begin with Kelenderis; what lay west of it did not belong to Kilikia. Pomponius Mela and Plinius, however, give Anemurium as the western limit. As to the pass between Kilikia and Syria, it was what is to-day the pass in the Province So, and not the one in Demir Kapu.

83. *Zu Minucius Felix.* Eussner, Würzburg. In Oct. 10, 3 *non regnata* is proposed for *non regna*.

84. *Zu Hesychios Milesios.* Hesselmeyer, Tübingen. Critical notes.

85. Ein vermeintlicher archetypus des Lucretius. Brieger, Halle. Against Woltjer's hypothesis of an original codex as common source for those now in existence (Jahrb., 1881, pp. 769-83). This hypothesis is based upon the fact that omissions, interpolations, and disarrangement of lines are not infrequently separated from one another by an interval of 13 lines, or a multiple of 13. Of this Brieger makes a critical examination, coming to the conclusion that the number of places where corruptions of the text, of any character at all, occur and can be explained on this hypothesis, is very small; and over against this number stands a still larger one of corruptions which speak directly against it. There are only 25 cases to support W.'s hypothesis—too few, according to the reviewer, to render probable the existence of this archetype, with its 26 lines to a page, 13 to a column.

86. Zu Ciceros briefwechsel mit M. Brutus. O. E. Schmidt. This comes as a protest against the rather general acceptance of Meyer's skeptical views touching some of the letters to Brutus, in his pamphlet, "Untersuchung über die Frage der Echtheit des Briefwechsels Ciceros ad Brutum." He examines Meyer's five or six specifications on the spuriousness of the third of the first book of letters; yet he comes to no convincing results that show Meyer to have failed at all.

87. Zur lateinischen anthologie. Eussner, Würzburg. A note on Seneca's *De Vita Humiliiori*.

88. Zur Orestis Tragoedia. K. Rossberg. Textual criticisms on some 75 lines.

(50.) Philologische gelegenheitsschriften.

Fascicle 9.

89. Das erste jahr des peloponnesischen krieges. Ein beitrag zur chronologie des Thukydides. H. Müller-Strübing, London. This is a lengthy article, running through 35 pages of this fascicle and 55 of the following. Lack of space would seem to forbid any adequate summary of it here; the article is commended in its entirety to those interested in the subject discussed.

90. Zu Horatius. A criticism by Hultsch of Schwering's note on Epist. II 2, 43. Certainly Horace, in using *curvo* and *rectum* in this line, does not mean that we should understand, as S. does, that he took a full course in the geometry of the Academicians, and that he alludes to the beginning of such a course here.

91. Die textüberlieferung der nicomachischen ethik. Susemihl, Greifswald. A reply to Busse in *Hermes* XVIII, pp. 137-47.

92. Engelmann's Bibliotheca, 1882, reviewed by Klussmann. "We still have, in this 8th edition, no bibliography of classical authors which answers the demands of to-day. The unqualified praise the work receives in the *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1883, No. 12, is greatly to be regretted."

93. Ein chorlied der Soph. Elektra. Plüss, Basel. A study of the question whether this choral song (vv. 472 ff.), wherein the curse resting over the house of the Pelopidae is the theme, is any disturbance to the "tendenz" of the

tragedy. Plüss takes the ground that it is not, but rather essentially in line with it.

94. *Pausanias und sein verteidiger.* G. Treu. A reply to Schubart's article in the preceding number. "The conclusion is inevitable that both Pausanias and Plinius drew their material from the same literary traditions, which were accessible at least by the middle of the second century B. C." As to the Polemon hypothesis, Treu is inclined to adopt it, as explaining the compiling of the events at Olympia in a literary form; and he may have been the author whom both Pausanias and Plinius followed.

95. *Zu Aristophanes Fröschen.* Drescher, Mainz. A critical note on v. 1124, in which  $\lambda\acute{e}ye\acute{t}\iota\acute{s}$  is proposed for  $\lambda\acute{e}ye\acute{t}\iota$ .

96. *Zu Valerius Maximus.* H. Wensky, Breslau. Critical notes on 8 passages.

97. *Zu Tacitus Agricola.* E. Bährens, Groningen. Four critical notes.

98. *Zu Martiales.* W. Gilbert, Dresden. Critical notes supplementary to Gilbert's *Ad Martialem quaeas. criticae.* Dresden, 1883.

99. *Zu Tacitus Annalen.* Konrad Zacher, Breslau.

100. *Differentiae sermonum.* S. Widmann, Wiesbaden. Hagen's *Anecdota Helvetica* (1870), pp. 275-90, give the *differentiae sermonum* which this article considers. Widmann has found portions of the same on the inside of the covers of an old book. These are given in this article, together with some observations on the differences between their readings and those of Hagen's.

101. *Zum Itinerarium Alexandri.* H. Rönsch. Critical observations on a dozen passages.

102. *Zu den Scriptores historiae Augustae.* Critical notes on Severus Imp. II 3; Alexander Severus IX 4; Probus IV 2, by J. Golisch, Schweidnitz.

#### Fascicles 10 and 11.

103. *Zu Xenophon's Anabasis.* R. Bünger. Four pages of critical notes on III 4, 19-23.

104. *Beiträge zur erklärung homerischer personennamen.* F. Weck. Review by K. Schirmer. The ending  $-κλη\acute{s}$  is not connected with  $κλέ\acute{t}\iota\acute{s}$ ; it is the same with *-culus* in Latin; *e. g.* in *Paterculus*. The ending  $-ιππο\acute{s}$  is for  $-πε\acute{t}\iota\acute{o}$ , seen in the endings of the Latin words *utpote*, *ipse* (= *isptē*).  $-πτολεμο\acute{s}$  is a superlative ending, so that *Δημόπτολεμο\acute{s}* = *crassissimus*, according to W.  $-μαχο\acute{s}$  has nothing to do with *μάχη*, but  $-μα-$  is a suffix used to form adjectives or proper names, and  $-χο\acute{s}$  is a diminutive ending, so that *Τηλέμαχο\acute{s}* is diminutive to *Τηλεμο\acute{s}*.  $-μενο\acute{s}$  is not connected with *μένο\acute{s}*, but is the same as in the Latin *Picumnus*, *Vertumnus*, etc. The review is favorable.

105. *Homerisches.* K. Frey. Three pages on (1) the story of the *Odyssey* and the *Nibelungenlied*, (2) the Nymph-Grotto in Ithake, (3) Minor Characters of the *Iliad*. Philaienes.

106. *Zur kritik des Aischylos.* H. Stadtmüller. Critical notes on The Persians and The Seven against Thebes.

(5.) *Zu Euripides.* H. Gloël. Critical notes on *Elektra* 545 f.; *Ion* 483, 1288; *Troades* 961, 1167-72; *Phoinissai* 983.

107. Zu Ciceros Cato Major. J. Ley. Notes on §4, 11 and §20, 75.

108. Vermischte bemerkungen. F. Rühl. A continuation of what appeared in 1878, pp. 309-20, in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher.

109. Zu Athenaios. K. Ohlert. Fourteen pages of textual notes.

(40.) Zur erklärung und kritik der homerischen gedichte. A. Gemoll. An interpretation and explanation of the word *μεσόδιμη*. He translates it *querbalken*.

110. Pausanias und Olympia. G. Hirschfeld. A reply to Schubart in Heft 7. "I still consider Pausanias as a compiler; people who give closer definitions might call him a plagiarist."

111. Zu Tiberianus. K. Rossberg. Critical notes on II 24.

112. A critical note on Vergil's Aeneid. By L. Mejer.

113. Die consonanten-gemination im Lateinischen. E. Baehrens. An article of some 20 pages, in two chapters; the first devoted to a consideration of the doubling of consonants before the time of Ennius; the second, to the condition in which the language was left and the tendency given to its orthography through the influence of his work. Baehrens throws overboard the theory that the assimilation of consonants in the middle of a word was a process carried on in the oldest Latin. Whole hosts of words were formed by dropping out single consonants or entire syllables. Quantity was an entirely unsettled thing at the time of Ennius, and it was one of his great contributions that, in finding it necessary for the purposes of his verse that vowels should have a settled quantity, he did so much toward fixing them. His process was exceedingly arbitrary, and often, of two quantities for the same vowel in the same word, he chose that which was not the correct one, but existed among careless speakers only, and suited his purpose. Thus *cella* is from *cilo*, but careful speakers pronounced the derivative *cila*. The second chapter traces the doubling of consonants down from the time of Ennius through the Ciceronian period.

(50.) Philologische gelegenheitsschriften.

## Fascicle 12.

114. Zu Sophokles Philoktetes. M. Schmidt. Critical notes advocating a recasting of lines 50-100. Lines 70-78, 66-69, 91-92 are held to be spurious.

115. Zur oekonomie der historien des Timaios. H. Kothe. A brief consideration of the evidence at hand to show the divisions of the history of Timaios, and a word in conclusion on the value of his history, drawn mainly from Polybios.

116. Zu den quellen der Messeniaka des Pausanias. G. Busolt. The framework of the history of the first Messenian war is taken from Thukydides and Xenophon; to fill it out, all kinds of details were resorted to, including even miracles and fables. Doubtless Pausanias's immediate authority put such details as these together from stories heard from the Messenians themselves.

(67.) Zu Aischylos. A. Lowiński. A note on Agamemnon, l. 518.

103. Zu Xenophons Anabasis. F. Reuss. Notes (1) on I 10, 9 f.; (2) on *λόχοι δρόσιοι*, which he considers equivalent to "reihen-colonnen"; (3) on III

4, 19-23. "Reckoning three feet for a man, each side of the square was 360 feet. The sides of the hollow space inside were 216 feet ( $=46,656$  sq. ft.)—enough space for the light-armed and the baggage."

117. Zum fünften buche der Aristotelischen Politik. H. Flach. Some 18 or 19 critical notes.

(40.) Zur erklärung und kritik der homerischen gedichte. A. Gemoll. Zur neunzahl.

(60.) Zu Dionysos von Halikarnassos. Some dozen critical notes by Carl Jacoby.

(78.) Zu Hieronymus de viris illustribus. A critical note on Chap. 59, p. 41 (Harding), by Terwelp.

(45.) Zu Ovidius Fasti. Critical note, by H. Gilbert, on III 497 ff.

118. Horazische allegorie. Th. Plüss. Whether the ode *O navis referent* be an allegory or not.

119. Zu Tibullus. E. Baehrens. A critical note on the first of the two Tibullian Priapea, p. 85 (Baehrens). Read *dux pecoris scaenae causa erat hircus avis*.

120. Die zeit der Lex Cornelia de Permutatione provinciarum (44 B. C.). O. E. Schmidt. "The law was adopted on the 27th or 28th of July."

121. Zu Ammianus Marcellinus. F. Vogel. On *densare* and *densere*.

122. Zu Gennadius de viris illustribus. Seven critical notes by W. Gemoll. W. E. WATERS.

---

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. XIII, Part 2.

J. J. Cornelissen contributes, pp. 115-34, Notes on Fronto, using Naber's Teubner edition. Two or three specimens will show the character of the whole. Ep. 49 (64), p. 90: *Id ut quam primum eveniat et dolor plantae quiescant (sic), di iuvent. "Iuware-ut dubito num usquam praeter h. l. legatur. Legendum existimo di diunt, quod a Frontone, veterum scriptorum sedulo imitatore, certe haud absonum est."* Ep. 57 (72), p. 92: *Desisse febriculam colligo ex litteris tuis. Nunc, mi magister, quod ad fauces attinet, brevi temperantia appelletur, et mihi at plenior nuntius veniet. "Haereo in appelletur, quod sine dubio corruptum. Nomen aliquod excidisse videtur, ita ut fere legendum sit brevi temperantia (morbus) depelletur . . . vel avelletur . . . sequentia emendavit Schopenus scribendo et mihi a te lenior nuntius veniet, quod probo, nisi quod pro lenior malum laetior."* Ep. 59 (74), p. 93: *Sed re vera illa res maxime mihi animum a studiis depulit, quod, dum nimium litteras amo, tibi incommodus apud Porcium fui, ut res ostendit. "Adscripsit Maius: 'Codex: portum, sed videtur emendatum Porcium.' Veram lectionem portum iudico. Per portum enim Aurelius Centumcellas intelligit. Ad villam ab Hadriano ibi aedificatam quam tum habitabat, Frontonem suum invitarat, qui, ex tepido cubiculo ad mare progressus, haud leviter perfixerat."* "Proba et genuina forma nominis proprii, quod legitur, pp. 111 et 137, *Demostratus* est, non *Demonstratus*. Littera *n* prave insertum saepius talia monstra verborum peperisse exempla docent, quae affert Corssen. . . . Onensimus, Atlans, Dymans,

*praenstantissimus* cett. Ipse Fronto habet, p. 235: *manlui*; pp. 17, 30, 88, et 132 *desiderantissimus* *passive*, p. 212, *epigrammantis*."

The next article, pp. 135-75, is filled by Herwerden with a continuation of his notes on Herodotus. The following may be taken as specimens. VII 37: *καὶ εἰρητὸν τὸν μάγον τὸ θέλει προφαίνειν*. "Praeferenda videtur librorum A, B, C, scriptura θέλοι, quia post verba rogandi noster, paucis locis exceptis de quorum sanitate dubito, usurpavit optativum in quæstione indirecta, sive pronomine interrogativo utitur sive articulus eius vice fungitur." VII 54: *τὴν δὲ ιστηραὶ ἀνέμενον τὸν ἥλιον [θέλοντες] ιδέσθαι ἀνίσχοντα*. "Quicumque de suo adscripsit θέλοντες non intellexerat veterem structuram verborum expectandi ab Homero inde usitatam. Supra V 35, 2, ἀνέμενε ἀναφένναι τὰς τρίχας . . . Thuc. IV 134, οὐκ ἀνέμενεν ἡμέραν γενέσθαι," etc. VII 163: *ταύτην μὲν τὴν ὥδον ἡμέλησε, ὁ δὲ ἄλλης εἰχετο*. "Barbarum huius loci structuram, in quo ne verbi quidem notio apta est, emendavi Ionis Euripidei editione, pag. 34, pro glossemate substituens genuinam vocem μετήκε, collatis glossis Hesychii μεθημούνη· ἀμέλεια, μεθήμων· ἀμελής, μεθήγ· ἀμελήσας." IX 2: *κατὰ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ισχυρὸν Ἐλληνας διωφρονέοντας . . . χαλεπὰ εἰναι περιγίνεσθαι καὶ ἀπασι ἀνθρώποισι*. "Verbum περιγίνεσθαι, cum iungi nequeat cum Accusativo Ἐλληνας διωφρονέοντας, aut depravatum est ex παριστασθαι, aut ante id sumenda es lacuna. Possis χαλεπὰ εἰναι (υκάν τε καὶ) περιγίνεσθαι. Cf. infra 27, περιεγενόμεθα καὶ (malim τε καὶ) ἐνυκήσαμεν θύνεα ἐξ (τε dele) καὶ τεσσεράκοντα." IX 23: *οὗτοι δῆ οὐκέτι οἱ ιππόται ὑπέμενον . . . ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἔκεινων ἀλλοις προσαπάλεσαν [τὸν ιππέων]*. "Stipes sit oportet, qui monendus sit equites amisisse ex suo numero equites, non pedites. Talia editores tolerare." Herwerden takes occasion in this article to criticise unfavorably several of Naber's recent suggestions, particularly his interpretation of the story of Melissa's ghost, in V 92, referred to in this Journal (Vol. VI, p. 520). He says: "Lenissimae sane mutationes, sed, ut mihi quidem persuasum est, non tantum non necessariae sed plane perversae. 'Inaudita querela est (inquit) quam tum deum intelligere possemus, si Melissa omni veste detracta in rugum imposita fuisse.' Sed enim ex ipso usu verbi συγκαταθάπτειν iam appetat non crematas fuisse Melissæ vestes, itaque falsam esse conjecturam συγκατακαθέντων et veram codicum scripturam οὐ κατακαθέντων. Si igitur vestes combustæ non fuerunt, probabile est pervetusto more . . . ne Melissæ quidem corpus concrematum fuisse sed integro corpore humatum. Sic facile intelligitur queri Melissæ umbram, quæ statim defunctæ corpus reliquisset, nullum sibi usum esse vestimentorum, quippe quæ cum corpore suo humi condita in sepulcro manerent, nec combusta animam suam in inferos descendenter comitari non potuissent. Fieri potest ut vetusta fabella ostendat nobis argumentationem eorum qui antiquissimum illum et rariorem sepeliendi morem improbarent. Utut est, combustis deinde iussu Periandri matronarum Corinthiarum quas ei detraxerat vestibus non nuda mansit, ut Naber videtur, Melissæ umbra, sed etiam calidior facta est et ornatiæ quam se fore speraverat, meliusque sic eius ira placari potuit quam *condendis aureis ornamenti in fossa*, ut Naberus adscita sua conjectura κατεκλήσῃ sequentia interpretatur. Praeterea κύσμον τὸν κάλλιστον non aurea ornamenta sed pulcherrimas vestes significare manifesto docet praegressum verbum ἀπέδνοε, ut taceam ex sensu quo Naberus voluit aptius esse κατέκρυπτε quam κατεκλήσῃ, nam in fossa aliquid κατακρύπτομεν, in arca κατεκλήσομεν. Tandem argutari mihi

videtur vir ingeniosus scribens, vestes in fossam collatas ne cremari quidem posse, dum fumus omnia obtineat et aer introcludatur. Quod ita verum foret, si aute cremationem fossa superne clausa fuisse, sed in patenti fossa satis larga et non nimis profunda, praesertim addita materie vim flammae alenti, contra esse appareat." "Non intellexisse mihi videtur amicus scurrilis sane et plus Aegyptiaci quam Attici salis habentis ioci rationem, qualem lascivorum puerorum more permisit sibi Amasis, qui Patarbemi, quem Apries iusserat ζώντα 'Αμασιν ἄγαγεν παρ' ἐωντόν, secum ire iubenti ἀπεματάσσε, καὶ τοῦτο μιν ἐκέλευε 'Απρίην ἀπάγειν. Nempe Patarbemi dicenti ἐκέλευσθ με βασιλεὺς παρ' ἐωντὸν ἄγαγεν σε Amasis ἀποπαρδών respondit: ἀντ' ἐμοῦ ἄγαγε τούτο. Nam corrigendum videtur aut ἄγαγεν pro ἀπάγειν, aut utrobique ἄγειν, ut priori loco exhibet recentior sed eadem melior codicum familia. Contra rescripto cum Nabero ἀπαγγέλλειν perit omnis dicterii aculeus."

We have next, pp. 176-87, notes by C. M. Francken on Tibullus. He says: "Me nunc invitat ad Tibulli lectionem EDUARDUS HILLER, recenti editione (apud B. Tauchnitz, 1885), quae . . . tutum se ducem praebet si quis purum a recentiorum conjecturis et figmentis cognoscere poetam cupiat. Prudenti iudicio ductus in editione, quae annotationem in margine non admittebat, ordinem versuum in codicibus traditum intactum servavit editor; nam nec Ribbeckii in una, nec Baehrensii in pluribus elegiis permutations, ut taceam iam de iis, quae Lachmanno aetate antecesserant, tanto assensu exceptae sunt, ut de iis apud doctos fere constet." He has most to say about Eleg. I 8, in regard to the want of coherence of its parts; and he thinks that the editors might have done more by the aid of the types to indicate the places at which there appears to be a rupture of continuity. "Ex offensione multorum interpretum efficitur satis certo ubi aliquid laxati sit: convenit plerumque de locis, ubi filum abrupmitur: hoc certe poterat notari." The remedy may be very doubtful; but "aliquid est διάγνωσιν facere, etiamsi θεραπείαν adhibere non possis. . . . Sed de hoc quidquid videbitur, illud nemo negabit iniuriam nullam fieri poetae et emolumentum parari legenti, si editor, ubi defectum cohaerentiae animadvertis, eius defectus indicium aliquid det. Similiter el. 4 post v. 14 lacunam notarem, si mihi Tibullus esset edendus. Complectitur subinde una elegia in codicibus duo aut tria carmina aut fragmenta, quae ad eandem rem pertinent et propterea iuxta posita iniuria in unum conflata sunt, ut factum videtur II 3."

Then follows, pp. 188-221, the first instalment of Disquisitiones de Pronominum Personalium formis Homericis, by J. Van Leeuwen, Sr. He begins by showing that the elision of *iota* in the dat. sing. is not infrequent in Homer (e. g. *ἀσπιδί* ἐνὶ *κρατερῷ*, Γ 349). "Facile tamen intelligitur, posteros hanc elisionem, quae durior ipsis videretur et a vitae quotidianaे usu abhorret, nonnisi invitox in antiqua poesi perpessos fuisse, et sicubi eam evitare possent evitasse; sive aliter verba collocando, sive voculam aliquam inserendo, sive contrahendo quae elidenda erant, sive ad violentius etiam remedium confugiendo, quale est illud quod proponitur in Schol. ad P 324: *κῆρυκ' Ἡπνούδη*] διὰ μέτρον συσταλέον τὸ πν, ut *κῆρυκι* scilicet recitaretur polius quam *κῆρυκ'*." The elision of *oi* was naturally still more objected to; "maluerunt interdum veteribus poetis vocabula obtrudere inaudita, quam admitterent elisiones quales posterior aetas evitabat." There are, notwithstanding, at least ten verses in which such an

elision must be assumed in *μοι, σοι, τοι, ε. g.* Z 165: δες μ' ἐθελεν φιλότητι μυγῆμεναι οὐκ ἐθελούσῃ. A trace of this is probably to be found in Attic in such places in the dramatists as Ar. Vesp. 776, *τοντί μ' ἀρέσκει*. Where the pronoun is written in full it is *μοι*, not *με* (as in Vesp. 828, *τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἀρέσκει μοι*), except in Ran. 103, σὲ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀρέσκει, which is probably corrupt. If the pronoun of the third person suffered the same elision, then "evanescente litera aeolica prorsus oblitterabatur. Uno tamen et altero loco exitium effugit. Sic Ο 105 cum apud omnes fere, metro invito, legatur ἐνθ' ἔσαν (F)οι πέπλοι, in codice Marciano verus verborum ordo servatus est, ἐνθα οἱ ἔσαν πέπλοι, id est ἐνθα Φ' ἔσαν πέπλοι." Other similar indications are adduced; and the assumption of the possible elision of this *οι* is used to correct various errors, e. g. K 285, *σπεῖδο μοι, ὡς ὅτε πατρὶ ἀμ' ἐσπειο Τυδέι δίω*. "At non hoc dixit, neque ita πλατειάσοντι dea aurem praebuisset; sed dederat poeta: ἐσπεῖδο μ' ὡς, etc. Apud Homerum enim aoristus ἐσπόμηται, natus ex σεσεπέμην, reduplicationem suam servat per omnes modos; legitimae igitur apud eum sunt formae ἐσπέσθαι, ἐσπειο, ἐσπόμενος, nec dubium est quin Aristarchus, cui merito editores Larochius et Christius obsequuntur, vere indicaverit (Schol. K 246): ἀνάγκη πᾶσα . . . δασύνειν καὶ τὴν μετοχὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰ ἀρχεσθεῖν." "Iam exhibebo vocabulum quod medium est intercismus. Antiqua est vox ἐπιτάρροθος, quae in deorum lingua idem significat quod posterioris aevi mortales vocabulo βοηθός indicare solent. . . . In originem vero Olympici huius vocabuli inquirere mihi quidem nefas videtur: nesciverunt veteres grammatici, nescire video hodiernos, et in perpetuum opinor nescient. Illi tamen malebant de etymo nugari quam ignorantiam profiteri. Quid igitur designaverint videre est in Etymologico Magno: ἐπιτάρροθος] βοηθός ισχυρός, σύμμαχος. παρὰ τὸ βόθος (βοθῶ τὸ παρορμῶ) γίγνεται ἐπιτάρροθος· καὶ πλεονάσμῳ τῆς ταρ συλλαβῆς ἐπιτάρροθος, δέ ἐν τῷ βοηθείν πρόθυμος καὶ παρορμῶν. . . . A voce igitur βόθος derivaverunt et literas ταρ abundare scilicet censebant. Quae vero abundant, sine detimento possunt abici: abiciantur ergo sicubi metrum hac medela sublevare possit! Abiecerunt homines, quos inane veriloquii studium a sana ratione deduxerat, et dum versuum numeros restituere sibi videntur, vocem antiquam misere mutilaverunt. Poeta enim cum Δ 390 dixisset: τοιη Φ' ἐπιτάρροθος ἦν Ἀθηνῆ et Ψ 770: κλῦθι θεά, ἀγαθή μ' ἐπιτάρροθος ἐλθε ποδοιν, illi ut elisio vitaretur, delicatis ipsorum auriculis parum grata, scripserunt οἱ ἐπιτάρροθος et μοι ἐπιτάρροθος, et usque ad nostra tempora illud monstrum propagatum est. Si quis hanc explicationem audaciorem ratus credere mihi recuset, auctor ei sum ut cum versu supra citato Δ 390 conferat locum parallelum E 808, et ipsi Sapientiae deae credit, iisdem ibi verbis sed paulo alteri dispositis idem narranti: τοιη Φοι ἐγάντιν ἐπιτάρροθος ηα." In a note he discusses and illustrates the usage and meaning of the real word ἐπιτάρροθος, which "adjectivum (non substantivum) . . . significabat idem quod ἐπιφογος, contumeliosus, et . . . a locis gemellis Homericis . . . prorsus est alienum." Space does not permit a further abstract of this article, which is exceedingly well written and worth reading, even if one cannot in all points agree with the author's conclusions.

J. Van der Vliet, pp. 222-7, gives some notes on the *Apologia* of Apuleius; and on p. 228 J. J. Hartman offers three conjectural emendations of the *Antigone* of Sophocles.

C. D. MORRIS.

## BRIEF MENTION.

Mr. WALTER LEAF's edition of the *Iliad, Books I-XII* (Macmillan & Co., 1886), will be reviewed at length in the next number of the Journal by a competent hand, and will there receive the praise that is richly due to it. Meantime it has been thought best not to withhold a criticism of sundry points that give a certain hold to the *advocatus diaboli*, who can never be absent when a book is to be canonized. Mr. Leaf's notes not only show good acquaintance with the current of Homeric study, but are full of independent suggestions, although one is disposed to rebel sometimes at the persistency with which the editor recalls some of his own lucubrations. Instead of one long and exhaustive note apiece on Lange's view of the conditional sentence, on Brugmann's theory of *sva*, and the editor's own interesting but not convincing treatment of *ēpeir* and *ēpeobai*, we are annoyed both by a recurrence to the same theme, line upon line and precept upon precept, and by a certain fitfulness of presentation, as if the writer had forgotten what he had said before. In short, the book reminds one too much of the editor's *Story of Achilles*, the defects as well as the merits of which were pointed out in this Journal II 107; and the intervening six years of study and experience have not brought as much skill as might have been expected in what may be called the manufacture of a text-book. The confused and confusing note on B 435 would have been cleared up by the simple consideration of the fact that *μηκέτι* in Greek is not absolutely equivalent to "no longer" in English, and does not require that an action should actually have begun, but only that the temptation should be present. See the commentators on Pind. O. 1, 5. 114. "The canonical authority of the Catalogue during the period of Attic literature" (B 557) ought to have been more fully illustrated. So under v. 719 by a reference to the Philoktetes of Sophocles 1027. B 597 read, "There is no necessity or other justification for saying that the opt. [here] represents the subj. of *or. recta*." In commenting on B 670: *καὶ σφιν θεοπέσσων πλούτον κατέχεντε Κρονίων*, Mr. Leaf is careless enough to say that Pindar's phrase in referring to the same shower of gold at Rhodes "is probably only a stronger form of the same metaphor, which he would not have misunderstood." Mr. Leaf has evidently forgotten the Pindaric context: *κείνοις δὲ μὲν ξανθὰν ἀγαγῶν νεφέλαν πολὺν δοε χρυσόν*. The curious fact, first noted by Benfey, that we have in Γ 276 a coincidence with the Sanskrit rule of the combination of a vocative with following nominative, is, as has been pointed out in A. J. P. II 88, nothing but a coincidence, inasmuch as the verse would not be possible without the nominative. It is hardly fair to call it hypercritical to make a distinction between *ἔβαντε* (Γ 311) and *ἔβη* (v. 261), and yet to refine on *δίδου* and *δῶκε* (Ζ 192, Η 305) and on *ἡγείτο* and *ἡγεσάτο* (Μ 101). To insist on a translatable difference, and to admit a sensible difference, are different things. In certain combinations Homer employs imperfect and aorist as sharply as any Attic writer (see on Pind. O. 4, 25), and this being so, we must

be slow to deny differences elsewhere (see A. J. P. IV 157). Extraordinary is the statement that E 288 "is the only case in Homer of *πρίν* with inf. after a negative clause." One example had already occurred, A 98; another was soon to occur, H 481; and enough to satisfy any one can be found in Ebeling's Lexicon, if the last ed. of L. and S. was beneath Mr. Leaf's notice. Unfortunately the point had been omitted in Monro's Homeric Grammar, which Mr. Leaf follows very closely. On H 125, Gelon's parody of this verse, *ἢ κε μέγ' οιμωξειν δὲ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων*, is cited as "an interesting proof of the date to which the consciousness survived that a short vowel, at least before a liquid, could be lengthened by the ictus alone." The proof loses much of its interest when one reflects how very loose the Greeks were in their adaptations of poetry, and how remorselessly they spoiled metre in so doing. Plato is a notorious instance. Doubtful form or not, it might be maintained that *βεβλήκοι*, Aristarchos's reading, Θ 270, is absolutely necessary. How can *ἐπει* with indic. be combined in a frequentative action with *δύσκεν*? The active voice of *ἰκαροῦ* can hardly be called unprecedented; at least we find *τὸν ικάρον(a)* in Pind. P. 2, 30, and see note on P. 4, 118. *ἰλέγχεν*, in the sense of "dishonor," may be purely Homeric, but the signification survives in the compound *κατελέγχεν*, Pind. O. 8, 19; P. 8, 36; I 3, 14.

According to a recent memoir of travel by Isabella Bird Bishop, the monks of Mount Sinai are still execrating the memory of Tischendorf. Whether the memory of the distinguished palaeographer Gardthausen will fare better remains to be seen. At any rate, both Gardthausen and the University of Oxford may console themselves for Eastern curses by the gratitude of Western scholars, on whom they have bestowed the handsome *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Sinaiticorum*. Scripsit V. GARDTHAUSEN (Oxonii, E Typographeo Clarendoniano, MDCCCLXXXVI). The library seems to have grown mysteriously like a plant, and to have shed its leaves mysteriously like a plant. Now a dying monk would bequeath his little store of books to the library, now a pious pilgrim would enrich the stock by a parting present, more or less voluntary. But many of the gifts went even more quietly than they came. In vain the warning words: *τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον τοῦ δγίον καὶ θεοβαδίστον δρόνς Σινᾶ· καὶ διτις ὑπερβασίει ἀπὸ τὴν δγίαν μονὴν να ἔχει τὰς ἀράς τῶν πατέρων τῆς ἀκαταφλέκτου βάτου.* The terrors which would naturally attach to the curses of the Fathers of the Burning Bush seem to have been neutralized by their bad Greek, and what monks and pilgrims gave, other monks and pilgrims conveyed to other libraries, and Sinaitic codices are found at Alexandria, Venice and Berlin, as well as at Leipsic and St. Petersburg. Still there are 1223 MSS that Gardthausen has fully described, besides a number to which he did not have access, and he avenges himself by the epigram 'Neque enim bibliotheca caret codicibus sed codices bibliotheca.' To the eye of the lady traveller just cited the library presented a goodly outside, but an expert in such matters would doubtless have discovered dead men's bones and rotteness enough. Five years ago, says Gardthausen, the MSS were in a most deplorable condition, many mutilated, many coverless, and many foul from decay and use, and in consequence of the general absence of folio numbers

he has found it necessary to add the thickness to the other dimensions of the codices. In its externals the volume resembles closely the beautiful *Fragmēta Herculānēsia* noticed in the last number of the Journal, VII 91.—There seems to be a curious significance in the selection of Lev. XXII 25 for the facsimile on the cover, but it may be a pure accident, and no reflection on the want of native enterprise or excess of native jealousy.

ΚΑΙ ΕΚΧΕΙΡΟΣΑΛΛΟΓΕΝC . .  
 ΟΥΤΤΡΟCOICETAITAΛΩΡ.  
 ΤΟΥΤΩΥΜΩΝΑΤΤΟΤΑΝΤΩ.  
 ΤΟΥΤΩΝΟΤΙΦΘΑΡΜΑΤΑΘ  
 ΚΤΙΝΕΝΑΥΤΟΙCΜΩΜΟC  
 ΕΝΑΥΤΟΙCΛΕΞΘΗCΕΤΑΙ  
 ΤΑΥΤΑΥΜΙΝ.

MR. HENRY SWEET has recently put forth *An Icelandic Primer, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1886), which is intended to supply the long-felt "want of a short and easy introduction to the study of Icelandic," Vigfusson and Powell's Icelandic Reader not being quite elementary enough for the beginner. Mr. Sweet has prepared this primer on the lines of his Anglo-Saxon one, and thinks it may "perhaps be the means of inducing some students of Old English to take up Icelandic as well." The Grammar (pp. 1-41), in which he acknowledges "great obligations to Noreen's *Altländische Grammatik*, by far the best Icelandic grammar that has yet appeared," is clear and attractive. One only wishes that Mr. Sweet had adopted the grammatical arrangement of the Braune school. The texts (pp. 43-81) "are intended to be as easy, interesting, and representative as possible." The most important are Thor and Útgardaloki, The Death of Balder, The Death of Olaf Tryggvason, Auðun, and Þryms-Kviða, or the song of Thor's quest of his hammer, "one of the finest of the Eddaic poems." The selection is a most happy one. Three pages of notes, a good glossary (pp. 87-107), and a list of proper names, make up the rest of the book. In preparing the texts and glossary Sweet acknowledges to have had great help from Wimmer's *Oldnordisk Læsebog*, which he considers to be, "on the whole, the best reading-book that exists in any language." The "book makes no pretension to originality, and will have fulfilled its purpose if it contributes towards restoring to Englishmen that precious heritage—the old language and literature of Iceland—which" their "miserably narrow scheme of education has hitherto defrauded them of." Like the author's A.-S. Primer, this is a practical book, from which much can be learned in a short time. It is adapted to make the study of Icelandic attractive, and is quite free from misprints and omissions, the only misprints noticed being *ungu* for *ungum* (dat. pl.), p. 16; *skor* for *skor* (in the glossary), and *seen* for *seem* (s. v. *þykkja*). The following words have been omitted in the glossary: *es* (= *er*, IV 114), *fari*, "reach," "range," "ability" (II 87), *gengt*, "opposite to" (VI 154), *gildra*, "to contrive" (VI 23), *görr*, "made," etc. (III 11, *görva*, acc. pl.), *hrjöta*, "to snore" (*hraut*, II 47),

67, *hrýtr*, 67), *kyrtill*, "kirtle," "tunic," etc. (VI 152), *par*, *i. e. par es* or *par er*, "where" (VII 54), *u-sælligr*, "joyless" (VII 94); *vanir* (VIII 61) should have been printed with a capital *v*. The mechanical execution of the book is perfect.

---

With genuine German disregard of order in time the first half of Vol. I of IWAN MÜLLER's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* comes halting behind the second half of Vol. II. It contains: A. *Grundlegung und Geschichte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, by VON URЛИCHS; B. *Hermeneutik und Kritik*, by BLASS; C. *Palaeographie, Buchwesen und Handschriftenkunde*, by the same, and the first pages of D. *Griechische Epigraphik*, by G. HINRICHС. It is fortunate that the general view of what people are still pleased to call 'science of antiquity' has fallen into the hands of one who interprets 'classical philology' in the wider sense. The sketch of the history of philology is, of course, somewhat rapid, and is more pleasant reading for one who knows the ground already than it can be for the class of students for whom it is nominally intended; and yet it must be granted that Professor v. Urлиchс has paused long enough on the great names to make the due impression on the beginner, and that he has done substantial justice to department and to school. Professor Blass is exceptionally well qualified for the parts that have fallen to his share, and even when one comes to his treatise on Hermeneutics and Criticism after a close reading of Boeckh's admirable sections on these subjects in his *Encyclopaedia and Methodology*, one marks the advance that the science has made and admires the clearness and practical sense with which principles and processes are stated. Many of the illustrations are drawn from Blass's own special sphere of work, and this gives great life and individuality to the treatment. In this respect one is again reminded of Boeckh, although Boeckh has sometimes drawn his examples from investigations in the results of which the philological world has not always followed him. The diligent use of this manual of Blass's would be of great service to the young philologist, who ought not to be left to pick up his knowledge of the subject from mere practice in the seminary, although, perhaps, it may be best to rouse the interest by practice before proceeding to theory. Every grammarian knows how often interpretation and criticism halt because the interpreter and the critic do not command the entirety of the grammatical material and method. The mere study of isolated points as they come up is not sufficient, and the same thing is true of every great department. Scrap knowledge is the bane of many scholars. Not to see a thing in its connection is not to see it at all.

---

The fourth half-volume (continuation of Vol. I) completes D (Greek Epigraphy), by the lamented HINRICHС, who was carried off by diphtheria a few weeks since; not, however, until he had seen this portion through the press. E. Roman Epigraphy, is by the masterly hand of Professor HÜBNER, whose monumental work was noticed in this Journal, VI 262; and F. Chronology of the Greeks and Romans, by the indefatigable and microscopic UNGER. These

names guarantee the high level of a work which is indispensable to every classical philologist, young or old. Reprints of the separate articles ("off-prints" is the last coinage, we believe) would be very welcome for convenience of use in classes. For such an "offprint" we have to thank Professor HÜBNER, and we hope that the publishing house will see fit to reproduce all the articles in this form.

---

The present writer has a grateful recollection of Curtius Rufus, whose history of Alexander the Great was a delightful interruption to the orthodox course of Latin text-books as read in the schools of forty years since, and when his turn came to compile a Latin Reader, he was not slow to accept an abridgment of Curtius as a part of it, and to say a few words in favor of the rhetorical worthy, who does not stand so high in the graces of schoolmasters as more tiresome authors. Hence he is disposed to welcome the edition of *Curtius* which Dr. M. C. P. SCHMIDT has recently put forth for the use of schools in the well-known Schenkl Bibliotheca (Leipsic, G. Freytag; Prague, F. Tempsky, 1886). This edition is not intended to be complete. In adapting the work for young students Dr. SCHMIDT has made many omissions, changes and additions. The omissions concern minor engagements, or matters that are either aside from the main story or unsuitable for tender youth. The changes pertain to the distribution of the narrative and to Curtian deviations from standard usage in vocabulary and form. The supplementary parts are taken from Freinsheim, so that the continuity is preserved, and a clear map accompanies the volume, which—like all the volumes of the Schenkl Bibliotheca—is very attractive in its appearance.

---

The sixth edition of Dr. HOLDEN'S *Cicero de Officiis* is noteworthy for the large number of Supplementary Notes, 36 pp. in all. In his preface Dr. Holden pays a just tribute to the work of C. F. W. Müller, to whom we owe the new recension of Cicero in the Teubner series, and acknowledges the assistance of that admirable Ciceronian scholar, Dr. J. S. Reid. Few editions of a classic have found so much favor as Dr. Holden's *De Officiis*, and the present revision makes the position of the work secure.

---

Dean CHURCH's *Trial and Death of Socrates*, a translation into English of the Euthyphron, Apology, Crito and Phaedo of Plato (Macmillan & Co.), was received with just favor upon its first appearance some six years since. In its new and beautiful dress, the translation revised and the introduction expanded, it enters the Golden Treasury Series as one of the most attractive volumes of the set.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Homer. *The Iliad*; ed., with English notes and introduction, by Walter Leaf. Vol. 1, Books 1-12. New York, *Macmillan*, 1886. 28 + 422 pp. O. cl., net, \$4.00.

Livius (T.) *The Siege of Syracuse*, by G. Richards and A. S. Walpole. New York, *Macmillan*, 1886. 32 + 119 pp. S. (Elementary Classics.) Cl., net, 40 cts.

Lucian. *Extracts from Lucian*, by Rev. J. Bond and A. S. Walpole. New York, *Macmillan*, 1886. 12 + 127 pp. T. (Elementary Classics.) Cl., net, 40 cts.

Lucretius Carus (Tit.) *De rerum natura libri sex*; ed. by H. A. J. Munro. 4th ed., rev. New York, *Scribner & Welford*, 1886. 3 vols., 903 pp. O. cl., \$9.60.

### BRITISH.

Aristotle's *Ethics*, An Introduction to. Books 1-4, and Book 10, ch. vi-ix, in an Appendix. By Rev. Edward Moore, D. D. 3d ed., revised. Cr. 8vo, 336 pp. *Rivingtons*. 10s. 6d.

Aveling (F. W.) *Notabilia of Greek Syntax*. 12mo, 54 pp. *Relfe*. 1s. 6d. Classical Examination Papers. Edit., with notes and references, by P. J. F. Gantillon. 3d ed. Cr. 8vo, 291 pp. *Rivingtons*. 7s. 6d.; interleaved, 10s. 6d.

Curtius (G.) *Principles of Greek Etymology*. Translated by Augustus S. Wilkins and Edward B. England. 5th ed. 2 vols. 8vo, 920 pp. *Murray*. 28s.

Müller (F. Max). *A Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners*. New and abridged ed. Post 8vo, 208 pp. *Longmans*. 6s.

Ritchie (F.) and Moore (E. H.) *Practical Greek Method for Beginners*. New ed. Cr. 8vo, 159 pp. *Rivingtons*. 3s. 6d.

Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments. With critical notes, commentary, and translation in English prose, by R. C. Jebb. Part 2. *The Oedipus Coloneus*. 8vo, 384 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 12s. 6d.

Strack (H.) *Hebrew Grammar*. Cr. 8vo, 81 pp. *Williams & Norgate*. 4s. 6d.

Yule (H.) and Burnell (A. C.) *Hobson-Jobson*. Being a glossary of Anglo-Indian colloquial words. 8vo, hf.-bd., 900 pp. *Murray*. 36s.

### FRENCH.

Binger (G.) *Essai sur la langue Bambara, parlée dans le Kaarta et dans le Béléougou, suivi d'un vocabulaire, avec une carte*. In-16. *Maison neuve*. Cart., 4 fr.

Psichari (Jean). *Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque*. L'article féminin pluriel au moyen âge et de nos jours et la première déclinaison moderne. Première partie. In-8. *Leroux*. 7 fr. 50.

## GERMAN.

Abel (Carl). *Einleitung in e. aegyptisch-semitisch-indoeuropaeisches Wurzelwörterbuch*. 3 Hft., 2 Hälften u. 4 Hft. 1 Hälften. gr. 8, S. 225-392. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. à Halbliefg. m. 10. (I-IV, 1, m. 70.)

*Anecdota varia graeca et latina*, edd. Rud. Schoell et Guil. Studemund. Vol. I. Lex.-8. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 10.

*Aristotelis metaphysica*, recognovit W. Christ. 8, xx, 330 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Barb (H. A.) *Transcriptions-Lesebuch der persischen Sprache*. Persisch-deutsches Glossar dazu. 8, iii, 99 S. Wien, *Hof- u. Staatsdruckerei*. m. 2.

Behrendt (Gust.) *Üb. den Gebrauch d. Infinitivs m. Artikel bei Thucydides*. gr. 4, 23 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1.

Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, hrsg. v. Dr. Adb. Bezzemberger. 11 Bd., 4 Hft. gr. 8, 1 u. 2 Hft. 202 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprech's Verl.* m. 10.

*Bibliotheca philologica classica*. Verzeichniss der auf dem Gebiete der class. Alterthumswissenschaft erschienenen Bücher, Zeitschriften, Dissertationen, Programm-Abhandlgn., Aufsätze in Zeitschriften u. Recensionen. Beiblatt zum Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der class. Alterthumswissenschaft. 13 Jahrg., 1886. 4 Hfste. gr. 8, 1 Hft. 98 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 6.

*Bibliothek, assyriologische*, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 4 Bd., 6 Lfg. gr. 4. Leipzig, *Hinrichs's Verl.* m. 30. (I, 1-4; II, III, 1; IV-VI, m. 24.) Inhalt: Alphabetisches Verzeichniss der assyrischen u. akkadischen Wörter der Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, Vol. II, sowie anderer, meist unveröffentlichter Inschriften. Mit zahlreichen Ergänzgn. u. Verbessergn. u. e. Wörterverzeichniss zu den in den Verhandlgn. d. VI Orientalisten-Congresses zu Leiden veröffentlichten babylon. Inschriften. Von J. N. Strassmaier, S. J. 6 (Schluss-)Lfg. iv. u. S. 961-1144 u. Wörterverzeichn. III, 66 S. (cpl., m. 150.)

Böckh (Aug.) *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*. 3 Aufl., hrsg. u. m. Anmerkgn. begleitet v. Max Fränkel. 2 Bde. gr. 8, xxviii, 711 u. vii, 517 S., nebst Anmerkgn. d. Hrsg. 217 S. m. rad. Portr. d. Verf. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. m. 30.

Bohlmann (Adf.) *Antiphontis de caede Herodis oratio, ex fide Crippiani maxime codicis recognita et in linguam germanicam conversa*. Pars I, continens §1-48. gr. 8, 41 S. Liegnitz, *Reisner*. baar m. 1.

Brandes (Ernst). *Observationes criticae de comoediarium aliquot atticarum temporibus*. Diss. gr. 8, 49 S. Rostok, *Schmidt*. baar m. 1.

Büchsenschütz (B.) *Bemerkungen üb. die römische Volkswirtschaft der Königszeit*. gr. 4, 36 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. à m. 1.

Buermann (H.) *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung d. Isokrates*. II. Der Urbinas u. seine Verwandtschaft. gr. 4, 22 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. à m. 1.

Bugge (Sophus). *Der Ursprung der Etrusker*, durch zwei lemnische Inschriften erläutert. gr. 8, 63 S. Christiania, *Dybwad*. m. 1.70.

Bužello (Just.) *De oppugnatione Sagunti quaestiones chronologicae.* Diss. gr. 8, 42 S. Königsberg, Koch & Reimer. baar m. 1.

Carrionis (Lud.) *In A. Gellii noctium atticarum libros commentarios qui exstant castigationum et notarum specimen alterum ex ed. princ. a Mart. Hertz depromptum.* gr. 4, 27 S. Breslau, Zimmer. m. —75.

Catulli Veronensis liber, ad optimos codices denuo collatos Ludw. Schwabe recognovit. gr. 8, xxiv, 156 S. Berlin, Weidmann. m. 1.50.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli). *Orationes selectae, scholarum in usum ed.* Herm. Nohl. Vols. II, III. *De imperio Cn. Pompei oratio.* In L. Catilinam orationes IV. 8, xvi, 65 S. Leipzig, Freytag. m. —50.

Clemens (Emil). *De Catulli periodis.* Diss. gr. 8, 61 S. Guelferbyti, 1885. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. baar m. 1.60.

Crusius (Otto). *Beiträge zur griechischen Mythologie u. Religionsgeschichte.* gr. 4, 28 S. Leipzig, Hinrichs' Sort. baar m. 1.

Curtius (Ernst). *Alterthum u. Gegenwart.* 2 Bd., 2 Aufl. gr. 8, vii, 347 S. Berlin, Hertz. m. 7.

Curti Rufi (Q.) *Historiae Alexandri Magni.* In breviorem formam redigit et scholarum in usum ed. Max. C. P. Schmidt. 8, xi, 174 S. Prag, Tempsky. Leipzig, Freytag. m. 1; Einbd., m. —25.

Devantier (Frz.) *Üb. das lateinische sogenannte "Relativum in der Verschränkung od. Konkurrenz."* 4, 18 S. Friedeberg Nm. Landsberg a. M., Schaeffer & Co. baar m. 1.

Faltin (G.) *Horazstudien. I. Über den Zusammenhang d. Briefes an die Pisonen.* 4, 23 S. Neu-Ruppin. Leipzig, Teubner. m. —60.

Forcellini (Aegid.) *Totius latinitatis lexicon. Pars altera sive onomasticon totius latinitatis, opera et studio Dr. Vinc. De-Vit lucubratum.* Distr. 28. gr. 4, 3 Bd., S. 553-632. Prati. Leipzig, Brockhaus' Sort. à m. 2.50.

Foerster (Rich.) *Die klassische Philologie der Gegenwart.* März, 1886, geh. gr. 8, 25 S. Kiel, Universitäts-Buchh. m. 1.

Förstemann (E.) *Erläuterungen zur Mayahandschrift der königl. öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden.* gr. 4, 80 S. Dresden, Warnatz & Lehmann. m. 5.

Goebler (Henr. Rud.) *De Matris Magnae apud Romanos cultu.* gr. 8, 77 S. Leipzig, Fock. baar m. 1.20.

Graef (Botho). *De Bacchi expeditione indica monumentis expressa.* Inest tabula. gr. 8, 56 S. Berlin, Weidmann. m. 2.

Hartel (Wilh. v.) *Üb. die griechischen Papyri Erzherzog Rainer.* gr. 8, 82 S. Wien, Gerold's Sohn in Comm. m. 1.60.

Hintner (Val.) *Griechische Aufgaben in zusammenhängenden Stücken.* gr. 8, v, 234 S. Wien, Hölder. m. 2.20.

Homeri hymni, epigrammata, batrachomyomachia, ed. Eug. Abel. 8, xxvi, 152 S. Prag, Tempsky. Leipzig, Freytag. m. 1.80.

Homeri Iliadis carmina, ed. Alois Rzach. Pars I. Carm. I-XII. 8, xxii, 296 S. Leipzig, Freytag. m. 1; Einbd., m. —25.

Jacob (Geo.) *Der Bernstein bei den Arabern d. Mittelalters.* gr. 8, 12 S. Berlin. Leipzig, Simmel & Co. m. 1.

Iustini (M. Iuniani). *Epitoma historiarum philippicarum Pompei Trogii ex recensione Frc. Ruehl.* 8, lxii, 315 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 1.50.

Keller (Otto). *Der saturnische Vers.* 2 Abhandl. gr. 8, 42 S. Prag, *Dominicus.* m. 1. (1 u. 2, m. 2.50.)

Klassizismus od. Materialismus? Von e. Umbefangenen. gr. 8, 49 S. Leipzig, *Reissner.* m. 1.

Kratt (Gfr.) *De Appiani elocutione.* Diss. gr. 8, viii, 68 S. Baden-Baden, *Sommermeyer.* m. 3.

Lehmann (C. A.) *Quaestiones Tullianae.* Pars I. *De Ciceronis epistulis.* gr. 8, viii, 136 S. Prag, *Tempsky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* m. 3.

Liebich (Bruno). *Die Casuslehre der indischen Grammatiker. Ein Beitrag zur Syntax der Sanskrit-Sprache.* 1 Thl. Diss. gr. 8, 30 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoek & Ruprecht.* 1885. baar m. 1.

Marquardt (Hans). *Zum Pentathlon der Hellenen. Mit 2 (lith.) Abbildgn. d. Gesamtkampfes.* gr. 4, 22 S. Güstrow, *Opitz & Co. in Comm.* baar m. 1.80.

Martialis (M. Valerii). *Epigrammaton libri. Recognovit Walther Gilbert.* 8, xxxiv, 407 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 2.40.

Menge (Rud.) u. Preuss (Siegm.) *Lexicon Caesarianum.* Fasc. 2. gr. 8, S. 129-256. Leipzig, *Teubner.* à m. 1.60.

Michaélis (Carl Thdr.) *De Plutarchi codice manuscripto Marciano 386.* gr. 4, 26 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* m. 1.

Müller (Adf.) *Curvus, uncus u. Komposita.* 4, 38 S. Flensburg. Leipzig, *Teubner in Comm.* m. 1.

Ovidi Nasonis (P.) *Heroides.* Ed. Henr. Steph. Sedlmayer. 8, xxi, 100 S. Prag, *Tempsky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* m. —80.

Ovidii Nasonis (P.) *Metamorphoseon delectus Siebelisianus, seorsum ed.* Frdr. Polle. 8, iv, 224 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. —60.

Pānini's Grammatik, hrsg., übers., erläutert u. m. verschiedenen Indices versehen v. Otto Böhtingk. Lex.-8. 1 u. 2 Lfgn. Leipzig, *Haessel.* à m. 6.

Perthes (Herm.) *Zur Reform d. lateinischen Unterrichts auf Gymnasien u. Realschulen 3 u. 4 Artikel.* 2 Aufl. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 5.60. Inhalt: 3. Zur lateinischen Formenlehre. Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschgn. u. didact. Vorschläge. 1 Hälfte. Zur regelmäss. Formenlehre. viii, 68 S. m. 1.60.—4. Die Prinzipien d. Übersetzens u. die Möglichkeit e. erheblichen Verminderung der Stundenzahl. viii, 169 S. m. 4.

— Lateinische Wortkunde im Anschluss an die Lektüre. Für Gymnasien u. Realschulen bearb. 3 Kurs. f. Quarta. Das Wort nach seiner Ableitg. u. Verbindg. gr. 8. Ebd., m. 2. Inhalt: Etymologisch-phraseologisches Vocabularium im Anschluss an Vogels Nepos plenior. 2 umgearb. Aufl., besorgt v. Gymn.-Lehr. Karl Jahr. xv, 182 S.

Perthes (Otto). *Die platonische Schrift Menexenus im Lichte der Erziehungslehre Platos.* 4, 24 S. Bielefeld. Bonn, *Behrendt.* baar 1.50.

Plauti (T.) *Macci, comoediae, rec., instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit Frdr. Ritschelius, sociis operae adsumptis Gust. Loewe, Geo. Goetz, Frdr. Schoell.* Tomi III, Fasc. 1. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 4. Inhalt: Bacchides, rec. Frdr. Ritschelius. Ed. I. a Geo. Goetz recognita. xi, 144 S.

Przygode (Alfr.) *De eclogarum Vergilianarum temporibus.* Diss. gr. 8, 61 S. Berlin, *W. Weber.* 1885. m. 1.20.

Richard (Herm.) *Üb. die Lykinosdialoge d. Lukian.* gr. 4, 54 S. Hamburg, *Herold.* baar m. 2.50.

Rossbach (Aug.) u. Westphal (Rud.) *Theorie der musischen Künste der*

Hellenen. Als 3. Aufl. der Rossbach-Westphalschen Metrik. 2 Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 6.80. (1 u. 2, m. 1.4.) Inhalt: Griechische Harmonik u. Melopoeie v. Prof. a. D. Dr. Rud. Westphal. 3 gänzlich umgearb. Aufl. liv. 240 S.

Rustler (Mich.) Das sogenannte Chronicon Universitatis Pragensis. gr. 8, iv, 44 S. Leipzig, *Veit & Co.* m. 1.20.

Sachse (Ghold.) Üb. die 30 Rede d. Lysias. 4, 43 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. baar m. 1.50.

Saupe (Herm.) Quaestiones criticae. 4, 21 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. —80.

Scala (R. v.) Vortrag üb. die wichtigsten Beziehungen d. Orientes zum Occidente im Alterthum. gr. 8, 35 S. Wien. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —80.

Schultze (Mart.) Zur Formenlehre d. semitischen Verbs. gr. 8, 55 S. Wien, *Konegen*. m. 2.

Schultz (Jul.) Atto v. Vercelli. [924-961.] gr. 8, 101 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoek & Ruprecht*, 1885. baar m. 2.60.

Schulze (Ernst). Übersicht üb. die griechische Philosophie. 8, 78 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. cart. m. 1.20.

Schwarzlose (Frdr. Wilh.) Die Waffen der alten Araber. gr. 8, xvi, 392 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 12.

Sophokles' Tragödien. Erklärt v. C. Schmelzer. 5 Bd. gr. 8. Berlin, *Hubel*. m. 2.40.

Stahl (Ferd.) De Ausonianis studiis poetarum Graecorum. Diss. gr. 8, 48 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.

Studien, Wiener. Zeitschrift f. class. Philologie. Suppl. der Zeitschrift f. österr. Gymnasien. Red. W. v. Hartel, K. Schenkl. 8 Jahrg., 1886. 2 Hfte. gr. 8, 1 Hft., 174 S. m. 2 Photolith. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. m. 10.

Untersuchungen, philologische. Hrsg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 9 Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 4. Inhalt: Isyllos v. Epidauros. vii, 201 S.

Vergili Maronis (P.) Opera, scholarum in usum ed. W. Klouček. Pars II. Aeneis. 8, vii, 338 S. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. 1.25; Einbd., m. —25.

Vieze (Herm.) De Demosthenis in Androtionen et Timocratem orationibus. gr. 8, 44 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. baar m. 1.

Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Unter der Red. v. E. Windisch. 40 Bd., 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1 Hft. x, 188 S. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort. in Comm.* m. 15.

#### ITALIAN.

Catalano (C.) Grammatica della lingua greca secondo il metodo di Curtius. Parte I. Napoli. in-8, 196 pp. L. 2.80.

De Nino (A.) Errori di lingua italiana che sono più in uso. 3.ª ediz. Torino. in-8, iv, 84 pp. L. 1.20.

Sapeto (G.) Grammatica araba volgare ad uso delle scuole tecniche. 2.ª ediz. Firenze. in-8, 288 pp. L. 8.

— Dialoghi e conversazioni in italiano e arabo volgare. Firenze. in-8, 52 pp.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Anecdota varia Graeca et Latina. Edd. Rud. Schoell et Guil. Studemund. Volume I. Anecdota varia Graeca, Musica, Metrica, Grammatica, ed. Guil. Studemund. Berolini, *Apud Weidmannos*, MDCCCLXXXVI. m. 10.

Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum. Edita curante Carolo Schenkl. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*. Prague, *F. Tempsky*.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli). Orationes Selectae Scholarum in usum. Ed. Hermannus Nohl. Vol. III. De Imperio Cn. Pompei Oratio. In L. Catilinam Orationes IV. 50 pf.

Curti Rufi (Q.) Historiae Alexandri Magni in breviores formam rediget et scholarum in usum edidit Max. C. P. Schmidt, 1886. m. 1.

Homeri Hymni, Epigrammata, Batrachomyomachia. Ed. Eugenius Abel. m. 1.80.

Livi (T.) Ab Urbe Condita Libri I, II, XXI, XXII. Edidit A. Zingerle. Schulwörterbuch zur Germania des Tacitus. Mit 33 Abbildungen und einer Karte. 80 pf.

Vergili Maronis Aeneis. Edidit W. Klouček.

Brady (Jno. Everett). Die Lautveränderungen der neugriechischen Volks- sprache und Dialekte nach ihrer Entwicklung aus dem Altgriechischen. Göttingen, 1886.

Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Sinaiticorum. Scripsit V. Gardthausen. Lipsiensis. Oxonii, *E Typographeo Clarendoniano*, MDCCCLXXXVI.

Church (F. J.) The Trial and Death of Socrates; being the Euthyphron, Apology, Crito and Phaedo of Plato. Translated into English. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1886. \$1.25.

Dorsey (J. Owen). Indian Personal Names (Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Vol. XXXIV). Salem, Mass., *Salem Press*.

Folk Lore Catalá. Ethologia de Blánes, per D. Joseph Cortils y Vieta. Barcelona, *Alva Verdaguer*, 1881.

Fick (August). Die Homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet u. in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt. II Hälften. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1886. m. 10. (cp. m. 20.)

Griechische Grammatik für Gymnasien. Auf Grundlage der vergleichenden Sprachforschung bearbeitet von H. D. Müller u. J. Lattmann. I Theil. Formenlehre. 4te verb. Auflage. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1886. m. 1.80.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung. Herausg. von Iwan Müller. Vierter Halbband enthaltend: Die Fortsetzung von Band I. Nördlingen, *Verlag der C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung*, 1886.

Kaegi (Adolf). *The Rigveda: The Oldest Literature of the Indians. Authorized translation, with additions to the notes.* By R. Arrowsmith. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1886.

Leaf (Walter). *The Iliad.* Edited with English notes and introduction. Vol. I, Books I-XII. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1886. Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey.* \$4.00.

*Lexicon Caesarianum.* Confecit H. Meusel. *Fasciculus IV.* Berolini, *W. Weber.* MDCCCLXXXVI.

Menrad (Jos.) *De contractionis et synizeseos usu Homerico.* Monachii, 1886.

Murray (J. A. H.) *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles (The Philological Society's Dictionary).* Part II. Ant-Batten. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press,* 1885.

*Rudimenta Latina.* By John Barrow Allen. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press,* MDCCCLXXXV. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey.* 50 cts.

Sophocles. *For the Use of Schools.* Ed. by Lewis Campbell and Evelyn Abbott. (Clarendon Press Series.) New and revised ed. Vols. I and II. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey,* 1886. \$2.75.